

to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 656. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10937, a bill to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1725). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 657. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11665, a bill to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1726). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10308. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth A. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 11839. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 11840. A bill to limit the liability of shipowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11841. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give full force and effect to the operations of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11842. A bill to revise, codify, and enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 11843. A bill to protect postal patrons from obnoxious mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11844. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes", approved April 29, 1942, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11845. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to clarify the authorization of the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the benefits of such act to lands in urban areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 11846. A bill to amend the provisions of title 18 of the United States Code relating to offenses committed in Indian country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11847. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in the determination of annuities of

certain employees engaged in hazardous employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 11848. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 11849. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian Irrigation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11850. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of Federal financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11851. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that persons defamed during broadcasts by political candidates shall be afforded an opportunity to answer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H. Con. Res. 477. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to study land use and the growth of metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 651. Resolution providing for the printing of a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. Res. 652. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 653. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Res. 654. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Res. 655. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to non-Federal installation of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 11852. A bill for the relief of Henry Bang Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11853. A bill for the relief of Clarence Francis Edge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11854. A bill for the relief of Marika N. Vatakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 11855. A bill for the relief of Vitanonia Spinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 11856. A bill for the relief of Husamettin S. Safak and Sevim Safak, his wife, Firusan Safak and Firuz Safak, their minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 11857. A bill for the relief of Maria Stella Pezzo Calafato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 11858. A bill for the relief of Francesco Paolo La Franca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11859. A bill for the relief of Angela Lobianco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11860. A bill for the relief of Ligia Paulina Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11861. A bill for the relief of James F. Seger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11862. A bill for the relief of Lucia Benistati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 11863. A bill for the relief of Vernon J. Wiersma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 11864. A bill for the relief of Robert Murray McIntosh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11865. A bill for the relief of Frederick Henry Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 11866. A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Shin (Mary Rathbun); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 11867. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joak Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11868. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11869. A bill for the relief of Joseph Monaco and his wife Josephine Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

354. Mr. LANE presented a petition of the Boston City Council in favor of legislation for medical care for the aged in the social security system, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Peter M. Kemper, pastor, First Baptist Church, Pittsfield, Maine, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy blessings of the past and Thy promise that Thou wilt be with us this day and all the days of the future.

May Thy continued blessing rest and abide upon each Member of the Senate. Give to them the wisdom that can come only from Thee. Be Thou their strength, their guide, and their helper, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 21, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 21, 1962, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1595) to amend the Natural Gas Act to give the Federal Power Commission authority to suspend changes in rate schedules covering sales for resale for industrial use only.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 373)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the forty-third Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations for the calendar year 1961.

A number of our World War II Allies have fully discharged their financial commitments to the United States for assistance received under the lend-lease program. Most of the other countries continue to make payments on account in accordance with the terms of their settlement agreements. A few countries thus far have failed to meet their payment obligations.

During 1961, payments and credits on the various lend-lease accounts amounted to \$55,028,419.56, including interest. In addition, receipts on the lend-lease silver accounts totaled approximately 11,416,123.20 fine troy ounces.

Detailed information on the status of the various lend-lease accounts and other items of lend-lease interest are contained in the report.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 22, 1962.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5546. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act, as amended, with respect to screenings of seed;

H.R. 6664. An act to authorize the commandant of the Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate graduate legal degrees and credits;

H.R. 8333. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9844. An act to waive section 142, title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut for holding court at Bridgeport;

H.R. 10012. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee holding court at Winchester, Tenn.;

H.R. 10016. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Decatur, Ala., by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama;

H.R. 10389. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, holding court at Marshall, Tex.;

H.R. 10595. An act to facilitate the sale and disposal of Government stocks of extra-long-staple cotton;

H.R. 10617. An act providing that the U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof; and

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing October 14, 1962, as National Public Works Week.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5546. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act, as amended, with respect to screenings of seed; and

H.R. 10595. An act to facilitate the sale and disposal of Government stocks of extra-long-staple cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 6664. An act to authorize the commandant of the Judge Advocate General's School to award appropriate graduate legal degrees and credits; and

H.R. 8333. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9844. An act to waive section 142, title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut for holding court at Bridgeport;

H.R. 10012. An act to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee holding court at Winchester, Tenn.;

H.R. 10016. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Decatur, Ala., by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama;

H.R. 10389. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, holding court at Marshall, Tex.;

H.R. 10617. An act providing that the U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee and the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Stockpiling Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Edwin J. Roland, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, with the rank of admiral.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEASE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC SPACE FOR PUBLIC PARKING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease certain public space under and in the vicinity of 10th Street SW., for public parking (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

INVESTMENT OF FUNDS OF INSURANCE COMPANIES ORGANIZED WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, Washington, D.C.,

transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the Inter-American Development Bank (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the educational and cultural exchange program of that Department during the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT STUDY OF TREASURY TAX AND LOAN ACCOUNTS, SERVICES RENDERED BY BANKS FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Treasury Department study of Treasury tax and loan accounts, services rendered by banks for the Federal Government, and other related matters, dated May 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUTHORIZATION FOR STATE LEGISLATURES TO DISPOSE OF MINERAL INTERESTS IN CERTAIN SCHOOL SECTIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of January 25, 1927, in order to authorize State legislatures to dispose of mineral interests in certain school sections (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPEAL OF A PORTION OF THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 999), as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, commending Senator EASTLAND of that State for his recent speech in the Senate with respect to certain decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and also commending Senator STENNIS, his colleague, for his defense of Senator EASTLAND; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Torrance, Calif., opposing the enactment of legislation to provide a Federal income tax on income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED— RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], I present a resolution

adopted by the city council of the city of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide medical aid for the aged under the social security system.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Boston City Council, in meeting assembled on May 14, 1962, do hereby memorialize Congress in favor of legislation for medical aid to the aged under the social security system.

Attest:

J. M. DUNLEA,
Assistant City Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3327. A bill to make certain federally impacted areas eligible for assistance under the public facility loan program (Rept. No. 1519).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated May 4, 1962, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3334. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make conservation reserve payments directly to assignees of such payments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 3335. A bill to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3336. A bill for the relief of Lazaro Loyola Arinque, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3337. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Georges Tsounos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF BOUNDARIES OF BIG HOLE BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the boundaries of Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, and to redesignate it as a national battlefield.

At dawn on August 9, 1877, a command of 182 U.S. Army troops and volunteers

headed by Col. John Gibbon plunged across the Big Hole River and attacked the sleeping Indian village of Chief Joseph's Nez Perce band. What followed was one of the most dramatic and tragic battles in the long struggle to confine the Indians to reservations and force them off the land wanted by the white men.

Chief Joseph was the leader of a band of Nez Perce Indians who refused to be bound by the treaty which confined them to the Wallowa Valley in Oregon Territory. In May 1877 they were given 30 days to cease their nomadic ways and remove to a reservation in Idaho Territory. Following several skirmishes with settlers they refused. After the Battle of the Clearwater in Idaho Territory, in which Chief Joseph extricated his band from a numerically superior force, the Indians decided to flee by way of the Lolo Trail and Lolo Pass across the Bitterroot Mountains to the buffalo country of Montana Territory. The pass was blocked by a small military force, and rather than surrender their arms and horses, they bypassed the fortifications and proceeded without conflict up the Bitterroot Valley to the Big Hole Valley.

Here on the night of August 8, 1877, the pursuing troops of Col. John Gibbon located the Indian camp. At dawn the next morning his command rushed the camp and in the attack women and children were not distinguished from warriors. Recovering from their shock the Indians made the soldiers' position untenable in the valley as they fired from all directions—the brush, the creek bank, the trees, the prairie, and the distant hills. The soldiers retreated back across the river and hastily dug rifle pits with bayonets on a forested neck of land that provided a good defensive position. Indian sharpshooters tied down the soldiers while the main body of Chief Joseph's band left the area, embittered, to turn south and east and later north to be caught at last in the Bear Paw Mountains a short distance from their long-sought refuge across the Canadian border.

Losses of the attacking troops consisted of 31 killed and 38 wounded. Officials reported 89 slain Indians on the battlefield, of which more than 30 were women and children. The loss in men, supplies, and lodges proved to be a great handicap to Chief Joseph in his retreat toward the international boundary. On October 5, 1877, he surrendered at Bear Paw Mountain in the northern part of Montana Territory just short of his goal.

A monument to the troops whose lives were lost was placed at the battlefield, and in 1910 President Taft ordered 5 acres set aside "for military purposes for use in protecting said monument." In 1939 the commemorative area was enlarged by Presidential proclamation to encompass part of the area to which the soldiers retreated, a total of 200 acres.

It has long been known to historians and other interested persons that the area now within the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument does not contain all of, or even the most important, action sites of the Battle of the Big Hole, but

precise location of the boundaries depended upon adequate historical information. Deficiencies in basic historical knowledge of the area have now been largely eliminated. Studies by the National Park Service, which administers the monument, have shown that the present 200-acre national monument actually encompasses only the site to which the troops retreated and where they entrenched during the battle. Not within the monument area are the following key battle sites: First, the Twin Trees, from which an Indian sharpshooter punished the retreating troops severely, and still standing a few hundred feet north of the monument boundary; second the site of the Nez Perce encampment where occurred the surprise attack by 7th Infantry troops on the Indian village and where the Indians rallied to drive the troops out of the partially destroyed village; third, the howitzer pit where, on the mountain side above the Nez Perce camp, soldiers directed several rounds of 12-pound shot at the surprised Indians before they—the soldiers—were outflanked; and fourth, the area between the Indian encampment and the Gibbon entrenchment where a running fight occurred in the retreat of the soldiers to their defensive position. This same ground also was the route of advance and deployment in the surprise attack on the Nez Perce village.

The boundary of the monument should include these areas if the story of the Battle of the Big Hole is to be properly told and the historic site preserved. In recent years between 9,000 and 10,000 people have visited the battle site annually. The Park Service has at present only limited facilities to handle these visitors. In addition to including the above-mentioned historical area within the monument, this proposal would provide the space needed for expansion of visitor-use facilities. Presently the only space available for development is too near important battle areas and encroachment upon the historically significant lands would result. The additional land which would be included within the monument—about 306 acres—is therefore needed not only for its historical association with the battle, but to provide for location of adequate visitor facilities as well.

We are proud of our historical heritage in Montana. We have, in the story of the Battle of the Big Hole, a significant chapter in the settlement and development of old Montana Territory. The battle is important too to all Americans as a reminder of the valiant, though futile, attempts of the Indians to escape from an imposed white man's civilization. This area seems, therefore, more aptly termed a national battlefield than a national monument, and this bill would redesignate the battlefield accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3335) to redesignate the Big Hole Battlefield National Monument, to revise the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HEALTH CARE INSURANCE FOR CERTAIN AGED INDIVIDUALS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 2664, to provide a program of health care insurance for individuals 65 or over who are retired, which will cover the cost of insuring an estimated one-half million beneficiaries of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937. These persons are presently eligible for health care benefits under my bill even though they are outside the social security system and costs for them would otherwise have come from general revenue. The contribution for these beneficiaries will be determined annually by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and be paid out of the Railroad Retirement Fund and added to the Federal Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on March 19, 1962, I introduced S. 3028, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. This bill provided, among other things, that 80,000 visas be allotted toward annual national quotas on the basis of the proportion which the number of inhabitants in each quota area represents of the world population. In order to facilitate computing the amount of quota numbers allotted to a country under this particular provision of the bill, I submit the following amendment to Senate bill 3028, and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962—AMENDMENTS

Mr. EASTLAND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendments lettered "5-21-62—A," intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER, to the bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. METCALF) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3225, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROXMIER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him,

to Senate bill 3225, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT IN CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 10650. This amendment relates to the tax exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers Union of America. It was introduced as a separate bill (S. 2953) on March 8.

A favorable report was received from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Stanley S. Surrey, on April 26. This report gives a full explanation of the bill and the several precedents for its enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment and the report from the Treasury Department appear at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the desk; and, without objection, the amendment and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment and report are as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"Sec. 22. MISCELLANEOUS.—The pension plan of Local Union Numbered 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, which was negotiated to take effect May 1, 1960, pursuant to an agreement between such union and the Building Trades Employers Association of Rochester, New York, Incorporated, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning May 1, 1960, and ending April 20, 1961, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interest of its beneficiaries."

—
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D.C., April 26, 1962.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to a request by your committee for the Treasury Department's views on S. 2953, "Relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America."

The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that this plan, which was established under a collective bargaining agreement, meets the requirements for qualification under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code for taxable years ending after April 19, 1961. However, the plan does not so qualify for prior taxable years, although the collective bargaining agreement specified that employers were

to make contributions under the plan as of May 1, 1960. This is because it was not until April 20, 1961, that a specific pension plan, indicating such features as the size of the benefits to be paid to retired employees and the eligibility requirements, was actually established.

S. 2953 would extend retroactive qualification under the Internal Revenue Code to the plan from May 1, 1960, the date from which the collective bargaining agreement provided for employer pension contributions, until April 20, 1961. The objective of the bill is to give the employers concerned the right to deduct contributions, made to the plan before it qualified under the Internal Revenue Code, in the year such contributions took place. In addition, the bill seeks to grant the plan exemption from tax on its investment income during this prequalification period.

In previous years the Congress adopted legislation extending to a number of negotiated pension plans retroactive qualification under the Internal Revenue Code for periods in which they did not qualify under the provisions generally applicable. Such retroactive qualification for specific plans was provided by Private Law 85-540 approved August 8, 1958, by Public Law 86-781, approved September 14, 1960, by Public Law 86-779, approved September 14, 1960, and by Public Law 87-59 approved June 27, 1961.

The Department has no objection to the adoption of S. 2953.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 9, 1962, the name of Mr. HARTKE was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3271) to establish a National Citizenship Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. SMITH of Maine on May 9, 1962.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1962, the names of Mr. ENGLE and Mr. CARROLL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3323) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. MOSS (for himself and other Senators) on May 17, 1962.

THE END OF THE BATTLESHIP "MASSACHUSETTS"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, next week, on June 1, the battleship U.S.S. *Massachusetts* will end her career as a vessel of the U.S. Navy. She has been a grand ship, and I cannot let this occasion pass without paying tribute to her accomplishments.

This great 35,000-ton battlegewagon is the sixth ship of the U.S. Navy to carry the name of Massachusetts. The first was built in the Boston Navy Yards in 1845—a 765-ton screw steamer, to be

used as a troopship for the Army. The present vessel is one of the last of the great men of war intended for classic naval action between ships. Moving at a speed of more than 27 knots, she had a crew of 2,500 men and carried 9 16-inch guns.

I have always had a special feeling for the ship. I was Governor of Massachusetts when she was being built at the Fore River Yard, in Quincy; and I was present at both her christening and her commissioning. I remember those occasions well. She was christened on September 23, 1941, a few months before Pearl Harbor, by Mrs. Charles Francis Adams, the wife of one of America's most famous sailors, who served as Secretary of the Navy under President Hoover.

Affectionately called "Big Mamie" by her crew, the U.S.S. *Massachusetts* was commissioned on May 12, 1942. I was aboard her when she passed through the nets in Boston Harbor, and I stayed aboard through her first night out, when she anchored in Casco Bay.

Within 6 months after the *Massachusetts* was commissioned, she fought a gun duel with the new French battleship, *Jean Bart*, during the landing of our forces at Casablanca. The Vichy-French fleet attempted to escape, but was driven back into port. Before the day was over, the *Jean Bart* was silenced and afire; and three other French battleships, four destroyers, and eight submarines were sunk. The *Massachusetts* was hit twice.

The following year, 1943, the U.S.S. *Massachusetts* went to the Pacific. There she participated in the great bombardments that supported our operations at Tarawa, Nauru, Kwajalein, Hollandia, Ponape, and Iwo Jima. She took part in one of the most decisive naval battles of the Pacific war—the battle for Leyte Gulf. She supported carrier task forces making some of the most important air strikes. In protecting the carriers, her antiaircraft batteries brought down many enemy planes. On one occasion her crew had to remain at battle stations for two straight days, while under repeated air attacks. The Japanese were not the only danger; the ship weathered three terrifying typhoons.

Finally the *Massachusetts* steamed with the 3d Fleet to participate in the last great offensive action of the war—the bombardment of Japan itself. Shortly after noon on July 14, 1945, people along the coast near Kamaishi, the Empire's largest iron and steel production center, saw the imposing sight of a line of big, fast, U.S. battleships moving swiftly in from the sea. They say that the *Massachusetts* came so close that it seemed as though some of her crew were about to toss a line ashore. Then she and her sister ships opened fire. The U.S. Navy, after sweeping all opposition from the Pacific, had penetrated to the very shores of Japan.

September 1, 1945, brought the end of the war; and because of her long period of duty in the war zone, the *Massachusetts* was one of the first to be given orders to head for home. Though she had participated in some of the most important battles of the war, she had

not lost a man in action. Hers is, indeed, a proud record.

Because I was present when she was built, and am now a Senator from Massachusetts at the time when, 23 years later, she is to be sent to her grave, my special feeling for this great ship can well be understood. Having fulfilled her purpose, she will now pass into the history of the U.S. Navy. We of the State whose name she carried with such honor about the world may be pardoned for voicing a sentimental "Well done, *Massachusetts*."

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished senior colleague.

It was with regret, tinged with a great deal of pride, that I learned of the Navy's decision to decommission the U.S.S. *Massachusetts*.

This giant of the seas has had a long and honorable history in the service of the U.S. Navy. She saw action in the Mediterranean, in the Coral Sea, the Gilbert Islands, the Marshall Islands, Kwajalein, the Carolines, and the Ryukyus and finally in the attack on the Japanese mainland. There was almost no area where American troops saw action in the Pacific where they were not backed up by the mighty guns and the brave men of the U.S.S. *Massachusetts*.

Many fine sailors from Massachusetts served aboard this ship, and their performance added lustre to our State's proud tradition of seamanship.

Since the war, the *Massachusetts* has been in inactive status with the Atlantic Reserve Fleet, in Norfolk, resting from her labors and revered because of her glorious days of action.

All of us in the Commonwealth are proud of this great ship, of the men who served aboard her, and of the U.S. Navy, under whose tradition this ship performed so nobly.

The U.S.S. *Massachusetts* was the sixth naval vessel to bear into battle the proud name of Massachusetts. I hope she will soon be replaced by another U.S.S. *Massachusetts*, and I believe it would be most fitting to have the new ship built at the Fore River Shipyard, in Quincy, the same fine shipyard where the vessel which we honor, with reverence, today was built.

I may say that I recall very well the day when I saw the U.S.S. *Massachusetts* on her maiden voyage. At that time my distinguished senior colleague was Governor of Massachusetts. I witnessed that great sight from another naval vessel; and how proud all of us were, that day, to have so fine a ship named after our State—the U.S.S. *Massachusetts*—and on her way to fight in that great war, for our great country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my colleague and I are very proud of the battleship U.S.S. *Massachusetts*.

AMERICA AND EUROPEAN DEFENSE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "America and European Defense," which was written by Walter Lippmann, and was published today in

the Washington Post. In the article there is, I believe, much commonsense which will be of value to all of us.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND EUROPEAN DEFENSE

(By Walter Lippmann)

One of the main reasons why our relations with General de Gaulle are seriously disturbed is that the Kennedy administration has decided not to alter the established policy, which is not to share with France, as we do with Great Britain, the know-how and the facilities of nuclear power. At first glance the cure for the trouble would seem to be to invite the French into the Anglo-American nuclear club.

But the problem becomes more complicated when we realize, as the British now do, that although they have a considerable nuclear power of their own, always assuming the overall protection of the United States, it is a power which is on the way to becoming obsolete. Because it is impossibly expensive, the British have already retired from the race in missiles, and they know that when the bombers become obsolete, say within the next 10 years, Britain will cease to be a nuclear power in its own right.

Thus our "special relation" in nuclear affairs is destined to disappear within a period of time. The time will not be much longer than it would take France, which is now far behind Britain, to make itself as strong in nuclear power as Britain is today.

The fact that Britain has already retired from the missile race and that it realizes that it has an obsolescent nuclear power, proves that the whole British effort was a mistake in the first place. We allowed ourselves to be persuaded to support the mistake by an amendment to the McMahon Act. The question today is whether to make compensation to France for that mistake, which time is curing anyway, by repeating the same mistake with France.

After much debate and soul searching the administration decided, I think rightly, that the original principle of the McMahon Act is sound, that within the Western Alliance the ultimate responsibility in nuclear affairs must be in one capital, not in two or three. For the United States the predicament would be intolerable if the key to the use of our strategic nuclear forces were not in Washington.

We have this power because we had to build it. Our nuclear power is, as a matter of fact, the core of the defense of Europe and of the West. We cannot allow this power to be set in motion by others. We must keep the ultimate right to decide whether and when it shall be used. A weak and independent nuclear force within the Western Alliance, a force which could start a world war but could not finish it, would be a danger to the peace of the world and to our own national security.

Not for a moment do I believe that the British would dream of committing a gross betrayal of the United States, which would be to buy admission to the Common Market by offering to France the nuclear know-how acquired from us. Nor do I share the view that the British have no other card, except betrayal of the United States, to play against General de Gaulle.

There is a very strong card, which is at once British and American, in what has been called the grand project. This looks to the admission of Britain and some other European States to the Common Market, to an association with it of the European neutrals, to a friendly accommodation with the Commonwealth, and with all this the partnership of the United States in a great open and low tariff trading area.

It must be understood in France and Germany, as I believe it is in Belgium, the

Netherlands and Italy, that the grand project is not a utopian contraption, nor is it an insidious American attempt to control Europe. It is based on the hard condition of the post-war world. The United States needs this large liberal trading area if it is to expand its trade and thus be able to earn the hard money to finance its military and civilian commitments overseas. For this reason, if Paris and Bonn wreck the grand project, there is almost certain to follow a severe retrenchment in our dollar commitments overseas.

There should be no illusions about this, particularly in Bonn. If the European Economic Community becomes a closed, restrictive and exclusive society, the United States will not be able to earn the costs of defending that community on the ground in Europe. The United States will be compelled to insist that the defense of this restricted Europe be paid for by the restricted Europe. With our dollar deficit what it is, with our mounting obligations in this hemisphere and in Asia, we shall not be able to go on subsidizing the local and tactical defense of the European continent.

We must see to it that this is understood in the places where the final decisions will be taken about the admission of Great Britain and about the partnership with the United States. I am confident that it will be understood.

OPPOSITION BY MINNESOTA STATE BOARD OF HEALTH TO USE OF HEALTH REQUIREMENTS AS A TRADE BARRIER, AND SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL MILK SANITATION ACT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, one of the many problems facing the dairy industry is that of artificial barriers to the movement of milk in interstate commerce.

Milk of high sanitary quality is being excluded from some areas by the use of special sanitary controls. There is a need, of course, for strict sanitary controls of fluid milk; and the exercise of such controls to protect the public health is primarily the responsibility of State and local governments. But there is no justification for special sanitary and health controls imposed for economic reasons to reduce competition.

The Minnesota State Board of Health, at its regular meeting on April 9, 1962, unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the use of health requirements as a trade barrier, and expressed its support of the National Milk Sanitation Act, a bill (S. 212) which I have joined my colleague, Mr. HUMPHREY, in sponsoring.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Minnesota State Board of Health, which I received from Dr. Robert N. Barr, secretary and executive officer, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, Minneapolis, Minn., May 15, 1962.

From: Robert N. Barr, M.D., Secretary and executive officer.

Subject: Federal milk legislation. H.R. 50 and S. 212, the National Milk Sanitation Act.

At its regular meeting on April 9, 1962, the Minnesota State Board of Health unani-

mously adopted the following statement and directed that the secretary furnish a record of the action to the entire congressional delegation from Minnesota:

"The State board of health is opposed to the principle of using health requirements, as such, as a trade barrier in the movement of milk, and for that reason is in favor of the proposed legislation (National Milk Sanitation Act)."

Although the sanitary regulation of milk production, processing, and transportation is, in Minnesota, a function of the commissioner of agriculture, the State board of health is familiar with the problems resulting from a lack of uniform standards of practice and acceptance. The proposed legislation provides a satisfactory means of applying such standards to the benefit of both importing and exporting areas and of the public health.

MISERY OVER CHINA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the exodus of refugees from Communist China has attracted world attention. When the British Government first undertook to return the refugees to China, there was an outcry of rage from the rest of the world, but until yesterday, there was no offer to help. The invitation now extended by the Chinese Nationalist Government in Taiwan should provide a welcome for these unfortunate souls, driven from their homes by the scourge of hunger, one of the hallmarks of a Communist state.

Although the action of the British in turning back the refugees is deeply regrettable, it has certainly served one good purpose: It has publicized more widely than would otherwise have been possible the desperate conditions in China, the utter lack of hope which these refugees personify, and the miserable failure of the Communist promises for China.

Unfortunately, refugees from Communist tyranny are no longer news. There have been so many over the last decades that we are used to it. What is news is the refusal of even the British, who have such a truly magnificent record in Hong Kong, to accept more refugees. With the assistance of Nationalist China, some restrictions can perhaps now be raised. Other nations may also make some efforts to help, now that the need is so overwhelmingly clear.

This mass exodus from Red China should be widely publicized throughout the free world, in the rest of Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East, in Latin America, and everywhere that Communist propaganda rings loud.

We should tell with equal force the bitter truth about communism in China. The story should be spread through the villages of Laos and South Vietnam, where too many free are still apathetic about communism. It should be spread by radio and other media to all the corners of the world where the voice of America can be heard.

I would hope also that the impact of the refugee problem in Hong Kong would be felt here in the Congress of the United States, here where there has been consistent refusal to reform our own immigration laws so that we might better help some of these people.

Two years ago the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] offered an amendment which would have permitted up to 50,000 refugees to enter the United States. This humanitarian measure was passed by the Senate, but, unfortunately, the House of Representatives refused to take it and it was deleted in conference.

At present, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] and myself, with a number of other Senators, have a bill that would also provide a specific 50,000 quota for refugees. These measures are long overdue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. The United States should move ahead in this area, to insure that the talents and skills, even the lives of these people, are not wasted. Congressional action along these lines would not only help these unfortunate people who need help so desperately; it would also focus the added glare of world publicity on the complete failure of the Chinese Communists to look out for the lives and welfare of the people of China.

THE AGRICULTURE BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the agricultural bill beginning on page 69 contains a very important provision: "Title V—Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products." I have a few words to speak on that subject.

I have mentioned before, and I say again, that in the State of Wisconsin we produce about 18 billion pounds of milk. The farmers are getting \$3.02 a hundred-weight for it.

I assert that the solution to the milk problem is to be found in three different channels: First, added consumption. We should drink more milk. When I say that, I mean the people of this country should consume more milk. There are children in this very city who need milk. There are children in other cities who need milk.

That point brings up another solution: More adequate distribution. We in Wisconsin cannot even send our milk to this city. Milk barriers have been built against us. In my humble opinion, more consumption and better distribution are needed.

Then I come to the third solution: industrial uses. In dairying, for example, I have long recommended—and now have a bill in the Senate, S. 2414, for carrying out—expanded research to find industrial uses for dairy products.

Although title V does not specify particular uses, the bill, significantly affirming my recommendations for dairying, does state that—

(d) Basic research in agricultural products and their uses is essential in any long-range program of benefit to agriculture;

(e) Research programs to develop new and improved uses for farm products and new farm products have potentialities for providing outlets for a larger volume of farm

production and greater stability of the prices of farm commodities;

(f) Public and private research agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, the land-grant colleges, other universities and research institutions, as well as private firms, can and should be utilized for an all-out attack on development of new and improved uses, and new and extended markets and outlets for farm products and byproducts. Research, pilot plant, development and trial commercialization work and corollary economic and related studies should be devoted to the expansion of industrial uses for agricultural commodities in surplus, and to any food and feed uses and replacement crops that can make substantial contributions toward the solution of the surplus problem. Facilities should be established as needed to permit adequate experimentation and testing, and production and market development, of promising new uses and new products;

For peanuts and corn, for example, a number of uses have been found for these products—not just for food, but for industrial purposes. The road then, is marked—providing a precedent for chemical research centers to find further utilization of the constituents of milk. Of course, people smile and laugh, and say, "You can't do it with milk." That is what some people said about peanuts and about corn.

In my humble opinion, if we are going to solve this problem, it will not be simply by waiting until the population catches up to production, but by better distribution, more consumption and the utilization of the constituent parts of milk for industrial uses.

WEST BERLIN'S INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times there is a very interesting article, with the headline "Berlin Industry Shows a 9-Percent Rise." My colleagues will recall that only a few months ago voices were being raised in this country, and elsewhere, to the effect that Berlin was a dying city. I am sure my colleagues will recall the news dispatches from Berlin and other European capitals stating that industry was leaving the city because of the wall erected by the Soviets and their East German puppet government. I am sure my colleagues will recall the stories about large numbers of moving vans which were operating in the city of West Berlin, taking household furnishings of families to other parts of Germany.

In other words, a mass exodus was reported from West Berlin. There were those pessimists who said the economic future of the city was doomed.

I am happy to put in the RECORD a report from Berlin which states that—

West Berlin's industrial production rose by 9 percent last year despite the closing of the border by the Communists and the loss of East German workers, the Chamber for Industry and Commerce said in its annual report today.

The report stressed that a growing shortage of labor and the need for intensified capital investment were the two main long-range problems Berlin's economy must solve to forestall stagnation.

The experts in the chamber believe that, unless industrial production expands to make Berlin one of Europe's largest produc-

tion centers, the city is destined to lose more and more of its manpower and attraction over the years.

But the encouraging note is that the great city of West Berlin has moved ahead again at a startling rate of industrial production. I think our Government can take some sense of justifiable pride in this accomplishment, because it was the prompt action of the President of the United States in July of last summer, and subsequently in September, that really protected the lifelines of West Berlin and gave the people of that city a new spirit of confidence.

The Vice President of the United States went to that great city, met with its officials, addressed an audience of hundreds of thousands of people, and greeted the first new troops of our Government and country coming to West Berlin. All of that had a very salutary effect.

I congratulate the people of West Berlin, their Government, their leaders in industry, commerce, and labor, for this demonstration of political vitality and moral courage and complete support of the principles of economic and political freedom.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article from which I have quoted be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1962]

BERLIN INDUSTRY SHOWS A 9-PERCENT RISE—U.S. PRESSES DRIVE TO GET MORE BUSINESS FOR CITY

BERLIN, May 21.—West Berlin's industrial production rose by 9 percent last year despite the closing of the border by the Communists and the loss of East German workers, the Chamber for Industry and Commerce said in its annual report today.

The report stressed that a growing shortage of labor and the need for intensified capital investment were the two main long-range problems Berlin's economy must solve to forestall stagnation.

The experts in the Chamber believe that, unless industrial production expands to make Berlin one of Europe's largest production centers, the city is destined to lose more and more of its manpower and attraction over the years.

TRAINING CENTER WEIGHED

Senator Karl Schiller, head of the Economic Department in West Berlin's Government, said one answer for the labor shortage that is being contemplated by U.S. planners is the establishment in Berlin of an international training center for automation and modern operations.

Dr. Schiller, an economics professor, spoke at a news conference on his return from a 10-day visit to Washington and New York. He discussed economic projects for Berlin with President Kennedy and U.S. economic experts.

Dr. Schiller said he was deeply impressed by the knowledge and interest shown by President Kennedy and by the enthusiasm with which American policy planners were responding to the Berlin challenge.

To illustrate Washington's urgency, Dr. Schiller recounted how he was called to a special meeting one night to discuss investments in Berlin with the chairman of a large business concern.

The businessman told him, Dr. Schiller said, that he had lunched with the President

the day before and that Mr. Kennedy had urged him to see whether his company could start operations in Berlin.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, the President's former representative in Berlin, and other U.S. officials communicated with about 70 U.S. corporations to urge them to set up plants in Berlin. About 10 have expressed interest in the idea.

Dr. Schiller said it was not a question at first of large or costly operations, but mainly a demonstration of American businessmen's faith in the soundness of Berlin's future.

The Berlin Industrial Chamber said in its report that orders for Berlin industry continued to pour in at a satisfactory, and in some fields at a high rate. In general, Berlin companies had orders for the next 8 to 9 months, the report said.

REVENUE SHOWS RISE

The revenue of Berlin's industry last year topped 9,500 million Deutsche marks (about \$2,400 million), rising by 870 million marks (\$207,674,000) over 1960.

The chamber's report noted that the increase in production was 3 percent higher in Berlin than in West Germany. In West Germany industrial output increased by only 6 percent.

In the talks in Washington, Dr. Schiller discussed a number of German-American proposals to strengthen Berlin's cultural and economic assets.

One proposal calls for the establishment of an institute for urban development. Still another would set up a training center for technicians from underdeveloped countries who would be sent to Berlin through United States or German grants.

TO PRESERVE OUR FREEDOMS WE MUST DEFEND OUR COURTS— ADDRESS BY CHARLES S. RHYNE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a recent address by Charles S. Rhyne, former president of the American Bar Association, entitled "To Preserve Our Freedoms We Must Defend Our Courts."

In this address Mr. Rhyne takes vigorous issue with the organized assaults on our Supreme Court and on some of the individual members of the Court. I know of no man who is more qualified to speak on this subject than Charles S. Rhyne, a most respected attorney.

Mr. Rhyne reminds us forcefully and eloquently that our freedom and the preservation of individual rights is dependent upon an independent judiciary. Mr. Rhyne notes that it is one thing to disagree with particular decisions of the Court, but entirely another thing to make destructive assaults upon the institution itself and to question the loyalty and integrity of the members of the Court.

I quote one paragraph from Mr. Rhyne's address:

There is a true saying that "evil grows when good men do nothing." A great evil is abroad in our land due to recently organized assaults on our Supreme Court and especially some of its members. Particularly is this true of such things as the recently conducted essay contest allegedly seeking reasons for impeachment of our great Chief Justice. The false implication that such reasons exist makes this kind of attack most reprehensible. We of the bar who follow every word uttered by the Justices most carefully—as we must to present cases there—know how false this innuendo is but we have

trouble in getting any newspaper to print our defense of the Court and its members. Charges are "news"—defense and denial are evidently not.

Mr. President, we are indebted to Mr. Rhyne for his fine defense of the Supreme Court as an institution of freedom. I hope that his address will be widely read, especially by our high school and college students who are now studying the operations of our Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO PRESERVE OUR FREEDOMS WE MUST DEFEND OUR COURTS

(By Charles S. Rhyne, past president, American Bar Association, Washington, D.C., before Churchmen's Washington Seminar, Washington, D.C., Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Feb. 28, 1962)

I am highly honored to be privileged to speak to you about the role of the Supreme Court of the United States in our system of government. In doing this I will follow the suggestion of your program chairman and relate my remarks up to critical attacks leveled against the Court in the recent past.

Our whole system of government can be summed up in the three words "rule of law" and the great paramount purpose of our system in the four words "individual liberty under law." We pride ourselves on the fact that we have a government of laws and not of men, but men are required to run our Government. The acts and actions of men are constantly examined and measured against our constitutional guarantees. It is our courts which do most of this examination and measuring. Our courts are therefore the most important organ in the maintenance of our whole system of government. When personal freedom and individual liberties diminish and disappear in other nations one always finds this to occur in proportion to the decline in independence of the courts. This stark fact underlines the tremendous importance to all of us of our courts, especially our Supreme Court of the United States.

But no discussion of the fundamentals of our system of government or our great national purpose is realistic without a recognition of the fact that our rule of law which guarantees individual liberty under law is based upon deeply felt religious principles. From America's inception, religion has been emphasized and utilized as a moral standard for our law. King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella in their commission to Christopher Columbus stated that it was given "by the grace of God" and recited that "it is hoped that by God's assistance some of the continents and islands and oceans will be discovered."

Nowhere is there better evidence of our Nation's regard for religion than in the field of law. Many things demonstrate this. The form of legal oath, the laws respecting observance of the Sabbath, the special consideration given to churches and church organizations under the law, and many others. Looking back at the history of our Nation two things stand out: The first is that we are a religious nation, and the second is that we are a "law-ful" nation.

The first colonial grant to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584 stated that it was from Elizabeth "by the grace of God." The first charter of Virginia granted by King James I in 1606 was "by the providence of almighty God." Language of similar import is found in the subsequent charters of other colonies. The celebrated compact made by the Mayflower

Pilgrims in 1620 recited that their voyage and colonization was "for the glory of God and the advancement of the Christian faith."

The Declaration of Independence recognizes the presence of God in human and governmental affairs in such references as the endowment of men "by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" and "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions" and "with firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence." State constitutions and the Constitution of the United States contain common declarations "prohibiting any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Along with these expressions of religious belief went similar expressions on the respect of our forefathers for the law. There is a universal concept pervading all of the basic law, and documents of our Government that ours was to be and is both a religious nation and a nation under the rule of law.

No one can study the history of law as we understand it without realizing that law was religion for centuries. It is no digression for me to remind you of the inextricable intertwining of our system of law and religion as my basic thesis tonight is our need to return to basic fundamental principles of our Government.

Those principles established beyond question the importance of our courts to every man, woman and child in America. They make it crystal clear that they, who by their actions weaken or undermine our courts, are undermining the very foundations of our system of government.

Recognizing the firm links of law and religion in our country, we lawyers deeply appreciate the interest of you religious leaders in our system of government under law and we seek your continuing help in defending that system. Ours is a system of government which in spite of the size of the Nation, and the necessary complexities of its organization, assures for the average citizen more vigorous protection for life and person, more widespread justice, more equality under law, more effective protection for individual rights, more evenly distributed economic opportunity, more security in person and property, and greater personal freedom than any other system yet developed in all the history of mankind. Our system stands as a beacon of light to oppressed peoples throughout the world.

But our system of government is dependent upon and no stronger than our courts. And our courts are no stronger than the strength of the public's confidence in them. The current irresponsible criticism directed at the Supreme Court makes this a most appropriate time to seek your help in maintaining public confidence in our courts as an institution of government. It is unfortunate that this criticism is often of such a scurrilous character that if left unrefuted it may lead to disrespect and loss of confidence in all law, all courts and our entire system of government under law.

There is a true saying that "evil grows when good men do nothing." A great evil is abroad in our land due to recently organized assaults on our Supreme Court and especially some of its members. Particularly is this true of such things as the recently conducted essay contest allegedly seeking reasons for impeachment of our great Chief Justice. The false implication that such reasons exist makes this kind of attack most reprehensible. We of the bar who follow every word uttered by the Justices most carefully—as we must to present cases there—know how false this innuendo is but we have trouble in getting any newspaper to print our defense of the Court and its members. Charges are "news"—defense and denial are evidently not.

The preamble to the "Canons of Professional Ethics" as promulgated by the American Bar Association provides:

"In America, where the stability of courts and of all departments of government rests upon the approval of the people, it is peculiarly essential that the system of establishing and dispensing justice be developed to a high point of efficiency and so maintained that the public shall have absolute confidence in the integrity and impartiality of its administration."

Our Government was established with three separate branches specifically to create a balance of power. The checks which each of these branches has on the others are our best insurance that the absolute power necessary to form a tyranny will never vest in any one branch. If the American public loses its respect for our courts, one-third of our governmental system of checks and balances will be stripped of its power. This is axiomatic, for no organ has power absent either respect or fear, and fear has never been an arm of democracy. If one of our three branches of Government may be destroyed, none are safe.

Unless our court system can maintain its position of dignity and respect in the eyes of our public, the foundation of our way of life is in danger. The truth inherent in this reasoning is sufficiently grave to merit our thoughtful, objective consideration. Personal reactions and personal judgment as to any individual decision of any court must be laid aside and the grave problem of the current situation considered.

It is deeply disturbing that the current organized nationwide attack on the Supreme Court by the so-called right wing has gone beyond criticism of individual decisions to the hurling of personal insults and vilification at Justices of that Court. This attack often uses falsehood and false innuendo resembling Hitler's "big lie" technique. It has reached the point where the confidence of the public in our Supreme Court as an institution of government may become impaired unless thoughtful men rise up and defend the Court and its members.

I call to your attention the fact that self-imposed judicial ethics and traditions forbid any response by the judiciary to attacks upon it no matter how false, or how personal, or how unwarranted those attacks may be.

Canon No. 1 of the American Bar Association's "Canons of Professional Ethics" provides in part:

"It is the duty of the lawyer to maintain towards the courts a respectful attitude, not for the sake of the temporary incumbent of the judicial office, but for the maintenance of its supreme importance. Judges, not being wholly free to defend themselves, are peculiarly entitled to receive the support of the Bar against unjust criticism and clamor."

Judges of our courts speak publicly only in the discharge of their judicial function. These men have given up the right to criticize in order that the rest of us might be secure in that right. But we have no such restraint upon us. It is, therefore, up to us to speak up in defense of our courts as an institution of government. Our duty is to see to it that our people have the correct facts and a proper appreciation of the place of the courts in our system of government.

We cannot be content merely to note the comforting fact that an institution which has survived the petulance and displeasure of a Jefferson, a Jackson, a Truman, and two Roosevelts—to say nothing of the tirades of lesser men—almost certainly has the strength and vitality to survive present attacks. We have our own obligations to discharge, and it is important that we not fail in those obligations.

It is not my purpose either to defend or to criticize any particular decision of any

court. My basic point is our duty and responsibility to maintain the confidence of the public in our courts. Such confidence is essential to our whole system of government. We must never allow that system to be impaired or destroyed by such unwarranted attacks as those which we read about in the press that certain members of our courts should be impeached when we know those charges are groundless and that the assailed judges are outstanding patriotic Americans entitled to the admiration and respect of our people for the outstanding manner in which they perform their duty.

We as a people may talk loud and strong of our rights and liberties, but our rights are as nothing without a redress and protection in the courts. Chief Justice Marshall so truly said: "The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside, it passes upon his property, his reputation, his life, his all."

Recall also that the preamble to our Constitution recites that one of the purposes for which our Nation was created was to "establish justice." Certain it is that the judiciary, as one of the three great branches of our government, has always played a basic role in the lives of our people. Our people have a right to justice, soundly and properly administered. And we have a duty to make the people secure in their rights.

The American people have not hesitated to rebuke powerful and popular Presidents who struck out against the courts and especially the Supreme Court of the United States. Our people are not likely to be swayed by the hysterics of the lunatic fringe and its sympathizers. But when the Court is assailed and not defended by sensible and well-intentioned citizens, citizens perhaps who have let their disagreement with individual decisions lead them into unthinking antagonism against the Court as an instrument of Government, then it is time to pause and rethink the fundamentals of our system of government.

You men of religion may feel deeply about past, present or future court decisions on such questions as use of public tax money for religious schools, bible reading in public school classrooms and any of a vast multitude of decisions which the Supreme Court must make in interpreting Federal and State constitutional prohibitions that State legislatures or "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Under our system of government the Court must decide these and other great issues upon which our people are often greatly divided. And do not therefore be shocked that the Court itself is just as often divided. These men though Justices are human beings. They have wives and children just as we do. They experience human reactions to the ups and downs of life just as we do. They even make mistakes as we do. Do not expect their judicial robes to transform them into supermen.

The important thing to put in proper focus is that under our system of government decisions must be made if that system is to operate, and the Court is our organ of government to make those decisions. Recall the paralysis of our country under the Articles of Confederation due in part to absence of an organ to decide great issues. Look at the impotency of the United Nations today due in part to lack of acceptance and use of the World Court. Then ponder the success of the European Economic Community where the European Court of Justice is deciding over 50 cases a year, thus insuring progress and avoiding the stagnation of stalemate which flows from lack of such a decision-making process.

But let me confine my remarks tonight to the United States rather than the world com-

munity. In this area we have plenty to discuss. Certain issues which have come before the Supreme Court recently have been highly controversial. The Segregation cases, regardless of their resolution, were bound to offend the convictions of an appreciable portion of our population. The Internal Security decisions grappled with the basic conflict between the rights of the individual and the necessary powers of the sovereign in the field of security. Again public opinion was bound to be divided. But what case in the Supreme Court is not highly controversial and highly important?

There are no easy cases in the Supreme Court of the United States. It gets only the most difficult of all cases. But the more important the case, the more nicely balanced the conflicting interests involved, the more essential it is that criticism and debate concerning the ultimate decision be conducted on a high plane.

I pause to point out that the Supreme Court considered some 2,000 cases per year. It hears oral argument and writes extensive opinions in more than 100 of these cases. Because of its important position at the apex of our system for the administration of justice it is essential that the Court confine itself to the great issues, the most important cases, and not waste its time on cases of no great consequence or otherwise it would not have adequate time to devote to its great function of deciding the major issues which come before it in a steady flow and which must be decided if our system of government is to work. We have 50 State supreme courts and 11 Federal circuit courts of appeal, as well as many other intermediate appellate courts in our country, where everyone is assumed of an opportunity to have alleged errors of our thousands of trial courts corrected. So please understand that not every case can be, or should be, considered or heard orally by the Supreme Court. I believe the Court does an outstanding job of selection of the cases it should hear.

Defense of our judiciary as an institution of government must not and should not interfere with or impair the right and duty of any man to express reasoned criticism of any decision of any court he believes to be erroneous. There is certainly nothing wrong with criticism of judicial decisions. Many great advances in our jurisprudence have stemmed from the reasoned criticism of judicial decisions. It is well to recall the opening sentence of Mr. Justice Brandeis' landmark opinion in *Erie Railroad Company v. Tompkins*. "The question for decision," he wrote, "is whether the oft-challenged doctrine of *Swift v. Tyson* should not be disapproved." Whether you agree or disagree with his conclusion, you must concede that Mr. Justice Brandeis' scholarly opinion was a tribute to the constructive criticism and searching historical evaluation to which the doctrine of *Swift v. Tyson* had been subjected. And that the Court should from time to time reexamine the basis of some of its decisions and reverse long standing precedents is not surprising. It would be surprising if the Court did not. As the Court itself has said, "Repeated error is still error." And the Court has never claimed to be infallible. I would say that the instances of such reversals of precedents are extremely rare. The stability of our law flowing from its decisions as precedents is therefore not impaired by those rare instances.

It is not at all disturbing that large numbers of intelligent persons should disagree with the legal reasoning of the Court, the authorities cited, or lack of them or the ultimate decision. One finds dissents to almost every decision from members of the Court itself. My complaint is against the personal insults hurled at members of the Court in place of criticism directed at their

decisions. One may disagree with an opponent, and yet respect him and his motives. Disagreement is a sure sign of intellectual activity—the freedom of thought which is essential to democracy. But when that disagreement runs rampant in the form of malicious charges directed toward undermining and smearing the reputation of an opponent, this is cause for freedom loving men to become alarmed. For this type of attack cares little for the virtue of truth. Especially when engaged in against those who cannot reply without endangering the Court of which they are members.

All of us are somewhat familiar with the overall history of the Supreme Court of the United States. In its decisions one can trace most of the significant social, political, and economic trends and developments of our Nation. The Court began its role as a resolver of great national issues in the classic case of *Marbury v. Madison*. The majority opinion by Mr. Chief Justice John Marshall stated that conflict between a Federal statute and our Constitution must be resolved in favor of the Constitution, the supreme law of the land. Although this declaration was actually mere dictum, it was widely accepted as controlling on the power of the Court to rule on the validity of Federal statutes.

Opponents lashed out at the language of the opinion. Many eminent men, among them President Jefferson, were extremely critical. They took the position that each branch of the Government had the exclusive power to pass on its own authority. Rational grounds were advanced for this argument. Certainly many persons must have considered the decision that the judiciary could overrule the legislature to be a violent misuse of judicial authority. Yet, now we look upon *Marbury v. Madison* as the very cornerstone of constitutional law. Absent this review of constitutionality of Federal legislation, the basic rights and freedoms we prize would be unprotected. The "gross usurpation of 1803" is the "genius of John Marshall" today.

McCulloch v. Maryland introduced a line of decisions in which the Court established the supremacy of the Federal Government in certain areas of power. Each infringement of States' activity and each addition to Federal powers brought forth a new barrage of criticism. So vehement and bitter were the feelings that several plans were suggested to limit or transfer the appellate jurisdiction of the Court, where validity of statutes were involved. A number of eminent persons, including Senators and Representatives, joined in this crusade; but, fortunately, wiser heads prevailed. We now recognize the value of most of these decisions. All sections of our great Nation have pulled together in time of emergency. Our commerce has not been hampered by duties, taxes or retaliatory measures between our States. The Court's interpretations of our Constitution, even in the face of violent opposition at the time when made, have made us nationally strong today.

The equality of man has always been a contentious issue. Every American reads in grade school how the Supreme Court returned Dred Scott to slavery. The hue and cry which arose from the abolitionists then was equal to any modern attack by segregation forces. President Lincoln was extremely displeased with the decision. But he made a statement which we would all do well to ponder. He said: "We know the Court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this. We offer no resistance to it."

This was the position of a man willing to shelve his personal disappointment rather than lead an attack as he said against "our whole republican system of government—a blow which if successful would place all our rights and liberties at the mercy of passion, anarchy, and violence."

This must be our position as thoughtful Americans. We must take the lead in upholding respect for our judicial system. Fight particular decisions if you believe they are erroneous. Endeavor to have them overruled. But we must not disparage the status of our courts as an institution of government by blanket attack upon the courts as an institution and especially by personal attacks upon justices or judges.

It is needless to continue tracing the history of the Supreme Court in support of the thesis herein stated. It is well known to all. Never a decade has passed that some great controversial economic, political, or moral issue has not been resolved by the Court. Time has proved many of the decisions to be not only correct but brilliant. Others were later seen to be shortsighted or shallow and were overruled. But would we have it otherwise?

Would it be better to have as our High Court of Justice a board of nine pacifiers whose chief function is to concede some basic value here (and withhold a little justice there) in an effort to appease a minimum of, say, 90 percent of the public? Or would we have nine legal minds, human men, not gods, who wrestle with the great judicial issues of our day and resolve them to the best of their ability?

Is our first concern that every decision be correct, important as this is? The answer is clearly "No." It is more important that we have independent judges, free to decide unfettered by outside pressures. If unpopular decisions can result in loss of appellate jurisdiction or irresponsible charges of impeachment against judges, how can we hope that fear of consequences of decisions—or what is even worse, political corruption—may not seep into and rust the scales of justice?

These are critical times. The forces of communism are constantly trying to undermine our institutions. One of their principal goals is to create distrust and dissension within our Nation—to make us doubt our way of life. Certainly this is no time for our own people to add impetus to the Communist attack. And let us never forget that no institution in our government is so directly opposed to the concept of a supreme state as our courts. The rule of law and the supreme state cannot co-exist. Supremacy of law over government insures freedom of man. That supremacy is insured by our independent judiciary. Destroy that independence and our freedoms are dead.

All Americans must be reminded of our priceless heritage of freedom under law. In our daily life we see the great principles of democracy applied by our court system. We tend to take them for granted. But whenever we stop and think, we must recognize that not one of our priceless freedoms—speech, religion, press, even criticism of government—would be safe without the final safeguard of the courts. The Supreme Court has been our bulwark of ultimate protection for the weak, the oppressed, the minorities, and the unpopular. Our whole future as a nation, and as a people, depends upon the maintenance of this independent judiciary to preserve the rights of our people.

In closing it is well to stress again that I am not here urging that our court system or our Supreme Court is above censure. No organ of government is. None of our institutions are perfect, including our courts. As Mr. Justice David Brewer of the Supreme Court said in 1898: "It is a mistake to suppose that the Supreme Court is either honored or helped by being spoken of as beyond criticism."

But there is a vast difference between criticism stemming from constructive analysis of particular decisions and the uninformed, misleading statements and insults

which are sometime being hurled currently. As President Lincoln suggested, time spent in ranting and raving would be better used working to establish the fallacy of the unpopular holding. But no degree of disagreement justifies degrading the foremost protection of our finest heritage—freedom under law—a protection only the courts can guarantee.

Public understanding of our courts and their supreme importance to each American is vital to the future of our Nation. Our American people have traditionally been ready to respect their courts and to look to them as the ultimate guardians of the liberties of our people. We must maintain that tradition to maintain those liberties. "Justice" as Daniel Webster said, "• • • is the greatest interest of man on earth. It is the ligament which holds civilized nations together. Wherever her temple stands, and so long as it is duly honored, there is a foundation for social security, general happiness, and the improvement and progress of our race."

To insure justice in our land, we must do all in our power to preserve the respect of the public for our courts. The stake of the public at large in this matter is tremendous. A respected and strong judiciary is essential to maintain our system of freedom under law. Maintenance of that freedom is essential to the continued liberty of our people and the continued liberty of our people is essential to the future of free peoples everywhere.

THE CHALLENGE OF UGLINESS— ADDRESS BY AUGUST HECKSCHER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past month August Heckscher, Special White House Consultant on the Arts, spoke in New York under the auspices of the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects. The title of his address was "The Challenge of Ugliness."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Heckscher's address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF UGLINESS

(By August Heckscher, Special White House Consultant on the Arts: Address prepared for delivery April 3 at the Conference on Aesthetic Responsibility; under the auspices of the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, let me say, first of all, that it is a pleasure to be here, in this company, and concerned with this subject. Since being named by the President, I have received many good wishes and many encouraging expressions of support, not only from individuals but from groups and organizations. I am glad to be able to acknowledge them and to say how much they have meant to me and to others involved in this work. The New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects has been particularly considerate and cordial. I thank them especially.

Now it seems to me that the "Challenge of Ugliness" is a good topic to begin on, for in declaring myself against ugliness I am certain to be on safe ground. In denouncing ugliness roundly and resolutely, I am hardly likely to lose any of these new-found friends. And I really don't want to lose them: I am going to need them all as we go forward along a path where troubles and perplexities are bound to accumulate. Indeed, I trust that as the work progresses I may continue to earn your good will.

Having said this, I should perhaps conclude and sit down. But I am constrained to confess that opposition to ugliness is not the whole of my platform, nor is a simple declaration the end of my discourse. I believe that our 20th century American society is entering upon a new phase, where the concerns and controversies of the past several decades are going to be muted or supplanted and a whole new range of interests is going to excite the public. Leaving aside the ever-present problems of the cold war, what has been the central preoccupation of our common life? It has been welfare. It has been the satisfaction of the private desires of the citizenry: the increase in their comforts and the multiplication of their possessions. But there is surely an end of the state more noble and enduring than welfare. The old measures in this field have reached a point beyond debate; new measures may still divide us, but they are destined to take their place, in one form or another, in the anthology of accepted reforms. Meanwhile the people begin to look beyond the acquisition of private possessions and indulgence in personal pleasures.

It is hard to know how to formulate these new and larger interests. I have used elsewhere the phrase "the public happiness." I like to think that this in some sense describes the satisfactions men find significant when they reach out beyond the search for security and for material benefits.

The arts and cultural activities form an important part of this realm. The widespread, lively interest in the development of the arts—you can discern it in the press, you can feel it amid the public and even in the Congress—is a symptom of a deep movement in public opinion, one of those transformations in our habits and ways of thinking which, once in a generation or so, create wholly fresh demands and possibilities.

Sometimes this enthusiasm for culture seems a little overwhelming. One fears that where such winds are blowing nice distinctions are going to get lost and the highest standards will prove difficult to maintain. The difference between the excellent and the second-rate, between the genuine and the spurious, between the artist and the amateur, are perhaps now in more danger of becoming blurred than in periods when the arts are neglected.

But the capacity to appreciate and enjoy, and the energy to create, certainly exist in a high degree among us. They may yet bring us out into an age of cultural achievement such as our country has not known before.

Now I would like to maintain today, before this audience, that the maintenance of beauty and fitness in the environment—a sort of comeliness in the world around us—is wholly as important as other forms of culture in determining the quality of a society. The things that are created by men working together, consciously or unconsciously, are the most durable facts about a civilization. They outlast the living generation; they carry forward, to be modified by time and by new men, the body of an age. Where we find that men have built meanly, without common purpose or a sense of the ideal, we can be sure that they lived meanly also—or at the very least that they lived with a disproportionate emphasis on the private sphere of life, neglecting the influences which can make a civilization out of an accumulation of individual existences.

What, after all, do we mean by a civilization? It is surely not the accumulation of private things. Nor is it, necessarily, the building of public things. In the "Republic," Plato complained of those who had heaped up physical structures and yet missed the most important aspects of a true civilization. They have filled the city, Plato complains, "full of harbors and docks and build-

ings and all that," and have "left no room for temperance or justice." Many of those arguing today that we have overdeveloped the private sector while neglecting the public sector fall into this fallacy; they seem to suggest that money spent in the public realm is necessarily and in all circumstances a boon.

Granted there are public needs poorly met and some not met at all, still a transfer of funds from the private to the public budget is no assurance of a higher degree of maturity and civilization. A civilization requires temperance and justice at the core—an inner sense of values in the light of which decisions are made. It implies an external order of things which are not only beautiful in their own way but correspond to a people's intrinsic sense of what is good.

The next decades will be a period of vast building and of great physical transformations of the American scene. It is not only that goods will pour from the factories. New highways will criss-cross the country. Cities will be torn down and rebuilt. The countryside will be made over into new forms of urban and suburban communities. Yet all this activity will not in itself mean that a civilization is being shaped. A civilization begins to manifest itself when men and women have begun to take thought about what it is they construct, and why, and to what end. It begins to be a living whole when the idea of beauty has found its place alongside the pressure of utility and the spur of need.

In the past history of this country, the outward pattern of things has, to an extraordinary degree, been left to chance—to the haphazard actions of special interests and groups. Sometimes it has seemed that as a nation we simply did not concern ourselves with the face of the land. The American Continent was so huge, its resources of land and forests and water so unbounded, that though men chopped away at them with only their own interests in mind we trusted that the great bulk of things would remain unspoiled. Sometimes we have assumed that private interests working competitively would create their own kind of fitness.

In strange ways this has often happened. The farming landscape, whether tightly knit in New England or spread across the mid-Western miles, has its peculiar beauty. The New York skyline reveals a spirit that no sculpture could have matched. But there are limits beyond which this faith in automatic artistry cannot be pushed. Where these limits are passed over, as in the sprawling roadside slums or the monotonous housing developments, the results have often been appalling. And the public has appeared to stand by helplessly.

Public agencies undertaking to mold the landscape or drastically alter the environment, have most frequently acted with a single interest in mind—to speed up traffic, to stop floods, to put roofs over needy people. All these separate things may be to the good. But the fact that these interventions were the work of lonely enthusiasts, or of bureaucratic experts, suggests that something has been amiss. Where was there a concern for harmony? Where was that sense of the whole which alone can give beauty and meaning to what men accomplish by their common toil?

When we look about us at the natural environment today we are struck by the degree to which it is subject to human designs. No part of it is safe from the bulldozer, from the land speculator, from the engineer and road-builder. When Theodore Roosevelt and Governor Pinchot started the conservation movement in 1908, their problem was essentially that of preserving a few key areas, or of instituting practices which allowed natural resources to endure and to reproduce themselves. Since then, the power

of man over nature has increased enormously. The great advances in human organization, in science and technology, have literally put into our hands the fate of a vast continental expanse. What we do with it is for us to decide. The forests that sheltered our grandfathers, we now shelter and preserve. The land that kept them is now in our keeping. We possess the earth as in no sense could it have been said of any previous generation.

Alas, what we do with it is often discouraging enough. The natural scenery may survive in its grander aspects; the great parks and mountains have been preserved and are appreciated yearly by increasing numbers of citizens. Elsewhere, however, the rash of cities spreads ominously from what were once tight and focused settlements; the roads bring their burden of stretched-out, undefined structures and habitations. These suburbs and strip cities, seen from within, bear out the disturbing impression gained from the sky: Too often they are defilements of the natural scene, wasteful desecrators of what have been free space and green land.

On sentimental journeys, on campings and outings of a summer season, the Americans show themselves still affectingly aware of the values implicit in a noble environment. If only they could heed as attentively the landscape which surrounds them through the rest of the year. It is one thing, they seem to feel, to retreat into the silence and loneliness of a forest (at least as much silence and loneliness as their ever-increasing numbers afford) but another thing to expect beauty or fitness in their everyday surroundings. They want a national park 3,000 miles away; they do not seem to care—or to care enough—if there is no park to which they can motor on a Sunday, or one to which they can walk in their lunch hour. They want the wilderness to be forever wild; but they seem unheeding if the roadways are forever cluttered with billboards.

Judged by the apparent attitude of too many present-day Americans, there is doubt whether we shall ever be able to extricate ourselves from a descending spiral of ugliness and irrationality. What is required is readiness to undertake on a large scale the kind of public works which are truly public—in the sense that they serve the highest interests of the citizenry; and truly works; in the sense that they are made to endure and to be judged by future generations. Yet it is this kind of undertaking for which it is often most difficult to muster support among the people. No foreign threat is so intangible but it can evoke a readiness to sacrifice and even a positive enthusiasm for the ordeal. No project, however costly or tenuous its returns, will be seriously challenged by the public if it can be shown that undertaking it will increase our material power. But if it is proposed that something be done by the people for their own delight and for the enhancement of their common life, a dead silence ensues. If someone suggests elegance in a public building, the matter is hushed up as if it were a scandal.

We have been prepared to call on the best architects in the country when it has been a matter of building abroad. The embassies and consulates that have been constructed in various countries over the past decade remind us what the United States can do—and what Government can do—when it sets beauty and excellence as a goal. The cultural center built by the Nation for the people of West Berlin shows that we are not unmindful of the value of a setting in which great public events can be fittingly held. At home, however, the story is different. We still wait to see accomplished a national cultural center in Washington. We might well feel impelled to ask, in regard to our own public buildings, whether we consider ourselves to be so

backward or uncivilized that we cannot enjoy the kind of beauty which we prepare for others.

We feel impelled to ask such a question—and yet in some dim way we sense an answer more hopeful than the face of things might seem to warrant. For there is certainly an influence taking shape which promises for the America of tomorrow a more sane appreciation of the true values which make a civilization. The environment can be man's greatest work of art; and it cannot be that while we strive for excellence and beauty in specific forms of culture—in painting, in sculpture, in literature, in poetry and music—we shall permanently minimize the significance of the outward world which surrounds us from our birth and insensibly makes us what we are.

Yet I would remind you in closing of the other side of the coin. It would be all too easy to fall from the error of underestimating the importance of beauty in the environment to the opposite error, assuming that environment by itself creates men and citizens. In "The City in History," that monumental book which has just won for Lewis Mumford the National Book Award, the author has some interesting things to say about the outward aspect of Athens in the classic age of Pericles and Plato. The picture we have in our minds, he says, is of a town with "a marmoreal chastity, a purity and rationality." This did not exist in fact. If the polis existed in this form it was afterward, in the third century B.C., when the impetus of the great age had been spent and men were settling down into an existence no longer fired by ardor and creativeness.

The Greek mind at the top of its bent possessed, besides its love of abstract perfection and its strong inner order, "the violent, tormented and irrational aspects . . . one finds in the tragic dramatists or in the rule horseplay and barnyard smut one encounters in Aristophanes." The Greek city reflected all this.

No one has been more scathing than Mr. Mumford in his denunciation of modern ugliness; yet Athens, he reminds us, kept in the period when life was at its highest development a casual jumble and sprawl. "The visible, tangible city," Mr. Mumford tells us, "was full of imperfections: the disorders of growth, the fermentations and secretions of life, the unburied refuse of outlived forms, not yet decently removed, the relics of rural ways not yet adjusted to the continued ordeals and challenges of urban life." Yet the Acropolis crowned it all, its serene form reaching above the town below, finding completion as part of the landscape of rock and blue sky.

In this tension between the old and new, between the perfection of the isolated form on the hill and the seething city below—between, as it were, earth and sky—Greek life found its moment of fulfillment. When that moment passed, Mr. Mumford tells us, "buildings began to take the place of men."

Let us make sure, as we build for ourselves, that men and their cities prove of equal worth. It is not, after all, only beauty itself, but also the striving for beauty that lifts up men and makes a civilization. We shall strive in our own way, as this second half of the century moves toward its meridian. Who shall say that the striving will not bring its own rewards? Who shall know where the greatest achievement will ultimately lie—within ourselves, or upon the enduring face of the things we have created?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Heckscher notes that in the past several decades government has been preoccupied with providing more adequately for the private desires of the citizenry, the

increase in their comforts, and a greater degree of security in their lives. As important as these welfare measures are, Mr. Heckscher calls attention to the neglect of government in the area of the arts and cultural activities. Mr. Heckscher states:

Judged by the apparent attitude of too many present-day Americans, there is doubt whether we shall ever be able to extricate ourselves from a descending spiral of ugliness and irrationality. What is required is readiness to undertake on a large scale the kind of public works which are truly public—in the sense that they serve the highest interests of the citizenry, and truly works; in the sense that they are made to endure and to be judged by future generations. Yet it is this kind of undertaking for which it is often most difficult to muster support among the people. No foreign threat is so intangible but it can evoke a readiness to sacrifice and even a positive enthusiasm for the ordeal. No project, however costly or tenuous its return, will be seriously challenged by the public if it can be shown that undertaking it will increase our material power. But if it is proposed that something be done by the people for their own delight and for the enhancement of their common life, a dead silence ensues. If someone suggests elegance in a public building, the matter is hushed up as if it were a scandal.

We have been prepared to call on the best architects in the country when it has been a matter of building abroad. The embassies and consulates that have been constructed in various countries over the past decade remind us what the United States can do—and what government can do—when it sets beauty and excellence as a goal. The cultural center built by the Nation for the people of West Berlin shows that we are not unmindful of the value of a setting in which great public events can be fittingly held. At home, however, the story is different. We still wait to see accomplished a national cultural center in Washington. We might well feel impelled to ask, in regard to our own public buildings, whether we consider ourselves to be so backward or uncivilized that we cannot enjoy the kind of beauty which we prepare for others.

Mr. President, I would like to commend Mr. Heckscher for this excellent address. There is no doubt in my mind that our institutions of government at the city, county, State, and Federal level have done little if anything to promote the arts and to encourage cultural achievements. I am pleased to note, however, a definite and ever-greater interest in this area. The progress at times is sparingly slow. To date, for example, we are still unable to get through this Congress such a modest measure as an Advisory Council on the Arts. I am nevertheless convinced that we will make progress and that there is ever-growing support for the Government taking a positive and active interest in the cultural quality of our society.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Van Nostrand Co., of Princeton, N.J., has brought out a second edition of Dr. Kenneth Colegrove's great book entitled "Democracy Versus Communism." This book by highly regarded Professor Colegrove is being widely used by colleges and high schools either as a textbook or as required reading as a reference source.

In addition, numerous chambers of commerce and patriotic organizations are distributing "Democracy Versus Communism" to important people in their communities who are molders of public opinion and community leaders.

So that those in and out of Congress who may not have had an opportunity to read this book can learn more about it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an interesting and informative book review of it, which was prepared by Professor Bouscaren, of LeMoyne College, Syracuse, N. Y.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF BOOK TITLED "DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM," BY KENNETH COLEGROVE—VAN NOSTRAND CO., INC., PRINCETON, N.J.

(Reviewed by Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science, LeMoyne College, Syracuse, N.Y.)

Prof. Kenneth Colegrove is one of America's most distinguished political scientists, and has made important contributions to our Republic in educational, governmental, and research capacities. He has made notable contributions to better understanding of the Communist threat, especially in the Far East. His work in helping bring to light the facts about the Institute of Pacific Relations was particularly valuable.

This is the second edition of his textbook for use in high schools, ably edited by Hall Bartlett, and supported by the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education. Until this textbook appeared, there was very little available in the high schools that was truly authoritative, which explained the Communist movement and the U.S.S.R. Nor was there very much sound information available in textbook form explaining the nature of our free-enterprise economy.

There were some criticisms of the Colegrove text based on the first edition. These criticisms concentrated mainly on the treatment of democracy, and to a lesser extent on the explanation of our economic system in the United States. The second edition meets these criticisms, and brings up to date the material found in the first edition.

Whenever anyone asks me to recommend a text for the high schools dealing with Americanism and communism, I always recommend the Colegrove text. The second edition contains important improvements, and I hope that as a result it will be even more widely adopted.

Some conservatives may well quibble here and there with Professor Colegrove on minor points. But it should be remembered that the purpose of the text is to reach as many people as possible. It is not designed to state matters so baldly and defiantly as to antagonize persons who might otherwise never learn what communism and the American system are all about from one so authoritative as Professor Colegrove. I have reviewed many high school texts, but I cannot think of any which do as good a job explaining communism and the American system. Such things as Communist influence in the Institute of Pacific Relations and its impact on our Far Eastern policy, Communist influence in the anticongressional investigating committee riots in San Francisco in 1960, etc., are discussed, to the best of my knowledge only in the Colegrove book.

My chief criticism of the textbook is its organization. Because of the topical method which is used, each chapter covers much historical ground. Thus, one will read about the Bolsheviks in an early chapter, and then, several chapters later, the author comes back

to them and their activities. I would have chosen a more strictly chronological discussion of the United States and Communist systems, saving the comparisons until the end.

The book is attractively put together, with excellent charts and photographs. The "captions and vignettes" on special aspects of Communist and U.S. life and personalities are especially well done. There is, unfortunately, no bibliography.

SPECIFIC CRITICISMS

Page 5: The author says that Soviet Russia started revolutions in the countries of east-central Europe during World War II. Actually it was a matter of supporting (and inducing the United States and United Kingdom to support) Communist-dominated resistance groups. The Soviets gained control of these countries through diplomacy (Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam), and through military invasion (sometimes called "liberation") in 1944-45. Then the Soviet followed up with the establishment of puppet regimes.

Page 14: Excellent tables showing Soviet record on treaty violations.

Page 16: The author should distinguish between neutral (Sweden, Switzerland, Austria) and "neutralist" (India, Ghana, Burma, Indonesia).

Page 16: The author states that the Soviet Empire encompasses 13 million square miles. As I add it up, it is 16 million.

Page 38: Although this may be too sophisticated for high school students, I think an effort might be made to distinguish between the British system (democracy-majority rule throughout) and the U.S. system (law-limited government based on checks and balances). Later on, page 84, Professor Colegrove does discuss very ably the U.S. system and its characteristics. But inasmuch as he uses the term "democracy" to describe both systems, it might be desirable to emphasize more clearly that there are different types of democracies (not only direct and representative).

Page 39: "The Indonesian people have had trouble maintaining a stable democratic government." In 1957 Sukarno choked off the remnants of constitutionalism with "guided democracy" (i.e., government guided by Sukarno and his handpicked advisers).

Page 53: The description of how the Communists won in Russia might include reference to the decisive aid given the Bolsheviks by the German Government.

Page 84: Excellent description of the U.S. system emphasizing that ours is a law-limited government.

Pages 116, 117: Excellent table of Communist aggressions, 1917-1961.

Pages 234, 235: Mention might be made that the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic preceded the U.S.S.R. Important from view of non-Russian nationalities.

Page 244: Good (and rare) discussion of war in China, 1945-49.

Page 379: The discussion of Soviet-Communist conquest should include meaning of "national wars of liberation" and the Communist differentiation between "just" and "unjust" wars.

Page 390: Discussion of Communist strength in Italy might point out to the student that in addition, the Italian Socialist Party is scarcely indistinguishable from Communists. Thus, almost half of Italian Parliament is a Moscow first group.

Page 398: Discussion of the United Nations effort in Korea should mention the outcome of the war: negotiated peace rather than military victory.

Page 401: Any subsequent edition will have to point out that neutralist (especially Indian) domination of the U.N. Congo force has helped Soviet and Communist influence to return to the Congo.

Page 407: The author writes: "This refusal to recognize the Soviet Union raised many difficult problems." He should point out what difficult problem the United States encountered prior to recognition of the U.S.S.R.

Page 417: Unusual and excellent discussion of Communist front groups, and the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Page 418: Mention should be made that Supreme Court decisions have all but nullified impact of the Smith Act.

NATIONALIST CHINESE TO ACCEPT REFUGEES FROM RED CHINA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, freedom loving people around the world were thrilled and encouraged yesterday by an Associated Press dispatch emanating from Taipei, Formosa, in which it is stated that the Nationalist Chinese Government has announced it is ready to accept all refugees from Red China wishing to come to Formosa from overcrowded Hong Kong, where thousands of hungry fugitives are being herded back across the border. I commend the Government of free China on this constructive decision.

I am sure the British Government is beginning to heed the worldwide protest against the unconscionable practice of sending these refugees from Red China back from Hong Kong to certain death behind the Iron Curtain.

We learn from the dispatch that from 6,000 to 7,000 refugees were rounded up last weekend and sent back to Red China by the Hong Kong government.

Mr. President, I submit that to send human beings to a "blood bath" in Red China, merely because of economic pressures which are placed upon Hong Kong, is one of the most atrocious international acts in recent history. I am highly gratified by the compassionate and cooperative attitude taken by the Nationalist Government of China, which has said, "We are willing to accept all these refugees"—except, of course, those who are Communist agents and Communists—"and will resettle them in Formosa."

The Chinese Nationalist Cabinet also announced a decision to allocate 1,000 tons of rice for immediate emergency relief for refugees now in Hong Kong.

Mr. President, I call upon the administration in the White House to work through its food-for-peace program; to take steps immediately, first, to make available from our surplus food stocks those foods which are necessary to help the British feed the refugees in Hong Kong; and, second, to make available to the Government in Formosa additional surplus foods required to supplement the foods they will be called upon to supply to feed the refugees they are now accepting from Hong Kong. This is, indeed, the purpose of the food-for-peace program. This is something we can do. We should do it and proclaim it immediately.

I should like to see our President present a sterling message which would be hurled around the world, which would say, "We will also establish the policy of making our food-for-peace surpluses of our American food commodities avail-

able to other countries around the world who are willing to accept these refugees from Hong Kong."

Mr. President, the people in Brazil are seriously considering accepting some of these refugees. I am sure many other countries will do the same.

I can think of nothing which could be done which would more encourage freedom fighters everywhere, including those in southeast Asia, in Laos, and Thailand, than to have a manifestation by the President of the United States that we will participate in the feeding of these refugees, whether they are in Hong Kong, whether they are transferred to Formosa, or whether they are accepted by some other non-Communist country of the world.

I visited the refugee centers in Hong Kong 2 years ago. I recognize the problem the British confront there. But I submit that it is not an adequate, nor a logical, nor a humanitarian, nor a Christian answer to send the refugees back, to put them on the bayonets of the Red Chinese. The world is properly astounded at that approach by the British. It is properly rallying to a great expression of global disapproval of that kind of attitude. I hope and believe the British Government will rescind its decision to send Chinese refugees home to certain death. I think our Government should assure the British of our support in meeting the very serious refugee problems it confronts. Providing extra food from our food-for-peace supplies would be an important start in the right direction and we should also express our official disapproval of the policy of sending the refugees back home.

I should like to see our Government today take the leadership in making available our surplus foods in order that this kind of mass destruction will not occur because the British are turning back at bayonet point those who escape, and actually turning over to the Communists in Red China those who have crossed the border secretly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press dispatch may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONALIST CHINA READY TO TAKE ALL REFUGEES

TAIPEI, FORMOSA, May 21.—Nationalist China announced today it is ready to accept all refugees from Red China wishing to come to Formosa from overcrowded Hong Kong, where thousands of hungry fugitives are being herded back across the border.

World criticism has rained down on Nationalist China and British authorities in Hong Kong alike because of the human tragedy of hungry Chinese being forced to return to Red China after escaping.

The United Nations and various countries have contended the refugees should go to Formosa. And the British, who say they simply cannot handle any more refugees, have been assailed on all sides for sending them back behind the Bamboo Curtain.

The Chinese Nationalist Cabinet announced the decision and allocated 1,000 tons of rice for immediate emergency relief for refugees now in Hong Kong.

ASK FOR HELP

At the same time, however, the Government decided to ask other countries welcoming refugees, such as Brazil, to help handle the tide of refugees.

Nationalist China has taken some of the refugees after careful screening since the influx into Hong Kong began shortly after the Red Chinese conquered the mainland in 1949.

The Free China Relief Association's agents in Hong Kong are now screening 1,000 refugees for resettlement in Formosa. But taking 1,000 refugees will make hardly a dent in the thousands upon thousands of refugees in Hong Kong.

It may take some time before any substantial number of refugees arrives in Formosa.

The Government plans security measures to safeguard against any influx of Communist agents trying to come to Formosa in the guise of refugees.

A joint meeting of Chinese Nationalist Interior ministry officials and the Free China Relief Association decided to expedite plans for reception and resettlement of refugees in Formosa.

WANT U.S. SURPLUS

The meeting also decided to initiate negotiations with the United States for allocation of surplus U.S. farm products for emergency relief for refugees.

Still another decision was to seek the support of Red Cross, religious and other organizations to induce the Hong Kong government to halt repatriation to Communist China of refugees escaping to the British colony.

This flow is continuing despite efforts of Hong Kong police and British troops to cut it off at the border of Red China.

From 6,000 to 7,000 refugees were rounded up last weekend and sent back to Red China, reports from Hong Kong said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased to hear the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. I intended to comment today on the announcement of the Nationalist Chinese Government that it is prepared to accept all refugees from Communist China who wish to come to Taiwan, which gives us new hope that effective assistance can be rendered to the tens of thousands of suffering Chinese refugees.

I take this opportunity to commend the Nationalist Chinese Government for this humanitarian offer, which will make it possible, at long last, for other nations, including our own, to render assistance to the refugees of Red China.

Up to this time, our hands have been virtually tied because of the refusal of the Red Chinese Government to express a willingness to discuss this problem or to express any interest in obtaining assistance for its starving people.

But now, with the offer by the Nationalist Chinese Government to accept the Chinese refugees, we have an opportunity to offer our food as well as other forms of material assistance to these unfortunate people.

Indeed, this is the purpose of one of the titles of the Food for Peace Act, relating to charitable contributions.

We have the food. We have the means of distribution. What is more, in Formosa or Taiwan, where the Nationalist Government of China is in control, the means of distribution for foodstuffs are well established. This matter has always been a problem, but

that problem is nonexistent insofar as the present situation is concerned.

We also have a friendly government in that area. We have American missions there that can work with the friendly government to supervise the proper distribution of whatever foodstuffs or other items we may wish to share with the needy refugees. We have an opportunity to demonstrate our generosity, our compassion, and also our desire for the freedom from Communist China of people from the Asian mainland. Those who seek escape from behind the Bamboo Curtain are suffering. Our assistance, however, must be an all-out effort, not piecemeal. We must open our hearts wide. We must put the machinery of the distribution of supplies at work at once, without the encumbrances of redtape or delay. We must recognize this as an opportunity to share with less fortunate human beings who have been the victims of cruel oppression at the hands of the Red Chinese regime.

I, too, was distressed by the action at Hong Kong, but as Americans we must recognize that we have a very exclusive policy with relation to the admission of Asians into our own country. We do not permit many Asian refugees to come to the United States. Therefore we ought not to point our finger too strongly at Hong Kong, which has accepted more than a million refugees in a limited area. I think it is extremely important, however, that we make it clear to any government that we are prepared to assist in the resettlement of the refugees, in terms of food, medical supplies, and clothing. The suffering people will need a number of items. The figures we have seen relating to the refugees reveal that they are lucky to escape from the mainland of China with the clothes on their backs. They have no material possessions or supplies. Therefore, just as we have aided refugees from East Germany, under the Communist puppet government, to come into West Berlin and West Germany—and millions came—we now have an opportunity to aid the people of China, who are basically friendly to the United States.

The other day I noticed that even the Chinese Ambassador of the Communist government of China at Warsaw commented that there was a feeling of friendship among the people of China for the United States.

I was very much displeased, disturbed, and unhappy about the comments of our Ambassador, who could not think of anything more to say than, "Well, we will have to think about that." What kind of diplomacy is that? What kind of public relations is that? Whenever an opportunity is presented to an Ambassador of the United States, particularly an Ambassador behind the Iron Curtain, when a representative of a Communist government frankly admits that the people of that country are friendly to the United States, I think that Ambassador ought to seize upon such an opportunity to point out that the desire of the Government of the United States is for friendship with people who have free governments. What an opportunity.

The failure to take advantage of such an opportunity permitted the timidity of traditional diplomacy to prevail. Our country stood almost mute and silent. Even silence would have been better. We stood there showing confusion through our representative. I hope that the Ambassador and representatives of the State Department will read my comments. I thought it was an unpardonable act to refuse to take advantage of an opportunity to express the traditional friendship of the people of the United States for the people of China. There is a great deal of friendship for that country.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to associate myself with the very fine statement made by my friend the Senator from Minnesota. I had in mind commenting upon the very point the Senator has made so eloquently and persuasively about what our Ambassador said and what he failed to say. But, if such observations came from this side of the aisle, they might be brushed off as partisan criticism. Coming from the other side of the aisle from a Senator of the reputation of the Senator from Minnesota, I am sure that no one would call it partisan criticism. It is common sense criticism. We are all Americans. Though I am sure it was unintentional, yet a great opportunity was missed. It shows the tendency of our soft approach on the diplomatic front, which is injurious to our interests.

While I am on my feet, I wish to add that I am happy to find myself associated with the Senator from Minnesota in the effort to call to the attention of the world the fact that there is a great opportunity here to strike a blow for freedom.

I am sure that if President Kennedy, with his great worldwide audience, supported by the reputation of America, will issue a clarion statement to the effect that the abundance and surplus of America will be made available through the food-for-peace program, to the British in Hong Kong to help feed the refugees temporarily, to the Nationalist Chinese in Taiwan to help the resettlement of the Chinese, and to other countries which accept Chinese refugees, he may encourage other countries, such as Brazil to render assistance, in order that patriotic, freedom-loving Chinese who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain may not be sent back to be put to certain death by the Communists, who are now unhappily in charge of the mainland.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

There is no doubt in my mind that our Government will respond promptly. The subject has been discussed with high officials of our Government. It has been discussed with the director of the food-for-peace program and with representatives of the State Department. The bipartisan emphasis today ought to be clear evidence to the administration, and particularly the State Department, that there is desire for prompt action.

Let it never be said that any refugee from a Communist country who sought a haven of rest, comfort, and assistance was rejected by free people in free countries. We are now prepared to cooperate with our neighbors, and with the Nationalist Government in Taiwan, so that those people can have an area of freedom.

I think it will be a wonderful experience for people behind the Iron Curtain to see the difference between a society on the mainland of China and a society with the social, economic, and political structures that are at work in Taiwan, in Nationalist China.

It will be a great experience for refugees who come to Taiwan to see the difference between Soviet foreign aid on the mainland and American foreign aid in Taiwan. Men pray for that kind of experience. This is a natural opportunity for our foreign policy, and our purposes of national security. Also, in the present instance there is a natural opportunity to demonstrate again that basically the United States of America seeks peace and justice. We are prepared at all times to share our bounty and abundance with those who seek freedom.

I point out again that it did not turn out so bad that we had an extra supply of food in our granary. Time after time our Government has tried to help people. Time after time needy people have been on the verge of starvation and famine. Time after time the abundance of our food and fiber, which some people condemn, has saved the lives of millions of people. It has saved countries. It has saved freedom in country after country.

As we approach the debate on the farm bill and on proposed farm legislation, let us never jeopardize that abundance, which is one of the vital factors in our strength today. Today the margin of strength on our side may very well be the abundance of food and fiber that our country possesses, compared with the rest of the world. What a great opportunity we have for doing good.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from today's New York Times on the Nationalist Chinese offer to accept the Hong Kong refugees, as well as an editorial on this subject from the New York Times and an editorial from this morning's Washington Post, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1962]
TAIWAN OFFERS TO ACCEPT REFUGEES FROM RED CHINA

TAIPEI, TAIWAN, May 21.—Nationalist China offered today to help solve the refugee problem in the British colony of Hong Kong, saying it was ready to accept all refugees from Communist China who wished to come to Taiwan.

This would furnish no quick solution, however. Moving the mainland refugees to this island would be a slow and costly process and many of the Chinese in Hong Kong do not want to come to Taiwan.

The refugees from Communist China have overloaded facilities in Hong Kong and since May 1, it is estimated, the British police

and soldiers have sent 32,000 back. This action has brought world criticism, but Hong Kong officials have said no one has offered to help with the problem.

Chinese villagers in Hong Kong pushed their children in front of trucks taking refugees back to China in an effort to halt the repatriations. Two children and a policeman were hurt.

OFFER TO COOPERATE

Criticism also has fallen on Nationalist China because it has taken only 15,000 of the 1,500,000 Chinese who have fled to Hong Kong since the Communists seized China in 1949.

A statement issued after a Cabinet meeting here said the National Government was willing to cooperate with all governments and relief agencies in tackling the problem. The Nationalists also expect to urge other governments to find homes for the refugees.

A special committee headed by Vice President Chen Cheng, who also is Premier, was set up to deal with the matter.

After the Cabinet meeting, Interior Minister Lien Chen-tung met with officials of the Free China Relief Association, which has been helping some of the Hong Kong Chinese to resettle on Taiwan. The meeting decided to speed up plans to bring Chinese to Taiwan, but the program is expected to be slow and costly.

All who have been accepted from Hong Kong so far have been screened.

Mr. Lien was reported to have told a secret meeting of Parliament, Friday, it would cost \$375 to bring each refugee here. Others estimate the cost at \$500 to \$750 a person.

How many will come to Taiwan is unknown. The Human Rights Council of Hong Kong has suggested 100,000 as a starter.

The Cabinet here decided to allocate 1,000 metric tons of rice as emergency relief for the Chinese in Hong Kong, but this would be only a start.

Mr. Lien and the aid officials also decided to ask the Red Cross, religious and other organizations to urge Hong Kong to halt the forcible repatriation of the refugees.

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1962]
THE HONG KONG REFUGEES

The Chinese Nationalist Government's announcement that it will accept any of the refugees from Communist China now pouring into Hong Kong who want to go to Taiwan is certain to have far-reaching repercussions. It may, for one thing, mean such a propaganda loss of face for Peking that the Chinese Communists will take drastic steps to stem the flow.

On Taiwan itself, where population density is one of the highest in the world, the actual arrival of a large number of refugees would create acute resettlement difficulties.

Meanwhile, the transfer of refugees from Hong Kong to Taiwan would very probably ensnarl the colony in a crossfire from both Peking and Taipei; and for Hong Kong now to continue its present procedure of pushing hungry escapees back into Kwangtung would bring an intensification of criticism already heard in many parts of the world.

As for the United States, the Nationalist move points up our involvement too. Congress could, as we suggested the other day, approve a proposal to increase the number of Chinese eligible to enter this country as immigrants.

The primary responsibility, of course, is Communist China's. The terrible privations that are causing the refugee flow are the result mainly of colossal Communist mismanagement of agriculture. The afflicted Chinese people could now get relief from the United States and many other countries if the Peking regime would signify its readiness to receive such aid.

[From the Washington Post, May 22, 1962]

FAMINE IN CHINA

Famine, that dread and ancient enemy of man, is again abroad in the world, stalking the vast plains of China, afflicting its teeming city masses, and hurling multitudes of starving men, women, and children against the barricades of Hong Kong.

The statesmen of this country, and of other countries which have food to give, have many reasons why they cannot act to meet this dreadful scourge. This country does not have relations with Red China. Red China has not asked for help. There is no room at all in Hong Kong. There is little room on Taiwan. There is no room anywhere. These are persuasive reasons; but they are not persuasive enough. They are not as persuasive as hunger.

They are not the answer to hunger. Hunger admits of no armistices, delays, treaties, or compromises. Diplomacy has not a good answer for it. Science has no answer. Politics and diplomacy and science are all very complicated. Hunger is very simple. And there is only one answer to it. That answer is food.

Sooner or later the West in general and the United States in particular will make that answer. The conscience of this country will not permit it to withhold any help it can give if the people of China continue to flood toward the barricades of Hong Kong. We may devise a reason a day why we cannot act. But the hordes beyond the barrier will produce 10,000 reasons a day why we must act. And the American people will be moved by these reasons. They will not understand why there must be hungry people at Hong Kong while there are granaries bulging with food in the United States. They will begin by blaming Red China for this dreadful calamity; but if we do nothing to avert it, they will end by blaming redtape. For all of our logical, plausible, tenable political reasons will sound like redtape if we let the dead pile up like so much debris along the Hong Kong barricade.

The world is face to face with another famine, like the terrible famines that have scourged mankind since the dawn of history. It is a famine that somehow seems more terrible because it is happening in a generation when man has dared even to attempt the conquest of space. How strange if such a generation cannot cope with this ancient foe. Perhaps it is partly because we have forgotten what sheer hunger is like. Maybe we need to hear old witnesses to its horror, witnesses like Laurence Binyon who contemplated the great famines of World War I and wrote in the London Nation for December 1918 these lines:

"I come among the peoples like a shadow
 I sit down by each man's side.
 None sees me, but they look on one another,
 And know that I am there.

"My silence is like the silence of the tide
 That buries the playground of children;
 Like the deepening of frost in the slow
 night,
 When birds are dead in the morning.

"Armies trample, invade, destroy,
 With guns roaring from earth and air.
 I am more terrible than armies,
 I am more feared than cannon.

"Kings and chancellors give commands;
 I give no command to any;
 But I am listened to more than kings
 And more than passionate orators.

"I unspeak words, and undo deeds.
 Naked things know me.
 I am first and last to be felt of the living.
 I am Hunger."

The Government of Nationalist China, by offering to accept Hong Kong refugees, has

taken a step that will make it possible for others to take useful actions. The way may now be opened for vast and effective operations that hitherto could not have been so readily accomplished. The world outside of Red China has, as yet, only the faintest intimations of the dimensions of the tragedy. However great it is, we have great resources at hand to meet it.

Let us rejoice that we have the means to turn back this ancient enemy of man. Let us embrace the opportunity to send food and blessings to Asia, as well as soldiers and weapons. Let us embark upon a great mission of mercy. Let us live up to our most honorable traditions. Let us demonstrate anew our historic friendship for the Chinese people. Let us send succor to those who beg for food at the barbed wire barricades of Hong Kong.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota with regard to supplying food to the starving Chinese who are trying in every way they can to get into communities where we can be of help.

I was pleased that the Senator from Minnesota mentioned that we must preserve our agricultural production so that we will be in a position to act in this connection.

I am seriously concerned about the proposal before the Senate today with respect to a reduction of the production of food which is so essential to help feed a starving world. I sincerely hope that as we proceed with the debate on the proposed farm legislation we will not jeopardize this great ability of ours to take care of these people. There is danger of it, because we are suffering in some areas through the reduction of the production of wheat by reason of drought.

I would say also that the United States today is probably the only wheat nation in the world. Argentina no longer is. Canada is practically out in that regard. If we are going to supply these people with food—and I am heartily in favor of it—we should have the food available.

I should like to mention also that there is a fine organization of people in Kansas, known as the Kansas Freedom from Hunger Committee, which has circulated petitions in our State and in other States, urging the supplying of food to Red China. Any such action would be rather difficult because we do not have diplomatic relations with Red China, and that government has not asked us to supply food. Therefore this situation is not so easy, diplomatically, to solve and handle as one where we are elsewhere confronted with starving people. We have an opportunity, and we have the food. I sincerely hope that we will take advantage of it and use it at this time.

I believe that an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning—"Famine in China"—is so timely with respect to this subject that I would have offered it if the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had not already done so.

THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO CUT THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am continuing to receive protests from government, civic, and business leaders, and other well-informed persons in Texas, protesting a reduction in force of the Texas National Guard.

In a statement on the Senate floor on May 3, 1962, I voiced my own opposition to such a reduction, and described the mounting concern in Texas and throughout the Nation at a move that many responsible people believe will weaken the important ready citizen military force.

Texas, always appreciative of its National Guard, became increasingly aware of its importance in time of crisis last year when guardsmen helped in the evacuation and care of some 200,000 persons fleeing before the devastation of Hurricane Carla. The troops stayed at the scene at great peril to protect that property. That was the greatest mass exodus in the face of disaster in a short time, in the history of this country.

As I have stated before, American troops are presently in danger zones at many points in the world and this is a perilous time to embark on a move to reduce our country's readiness.

There is every likelihood that such a reduction in force will be viewed with alarm by our allies, just as it is by many small and large communities throughout the country.

In support of my statement, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following resolutions from Texas:

A resolution from the City Council of Robstown, in Nueces County; a resolution from the commissioners court of DeWitt County; a resolution from the commissioners court of Galveston County; a resolution from the Chamber of Commerce of Houston, Harris County; a resolution from the City Council of Clarksville, Red River County; a resolution from the Brownfield Chamber of Commerce of Brownfield, Terry County; a letter from Mayor Ralph E. Seitsinger, of the city of El Paso, El Paso County, and a resolution from the Chamber of Commerce of Stephenville, Erath County.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF CITY OF ROBSTOWN, TEX.

Whereas it has been proposed by the Department of Defense to realine the Reserve components of the Army so as to eliminate approximately 22 National Guard units in the State of Texas; and

Whereas on numerous occasions in the past, the Guard Unit stationed in Robstown has lent assistance in times of local disaster, the value of which is immeasurable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Robstown, Tex., That this council go on record as officially opposed to any action which would either eliminate or seriously curtail the effective service of the National Guard in this city, and that this resolution be spread upon the official minutes and copies of the same be furnished to Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, Hon. JOHN TOWER, and Hon. JOHN YOUNG.

Passed and approved this 14th day of May, A.D., 1962.

B. D. BERRY, Mayor.

RESOLUTION BY COMMISSIONERS' COURT OF DEWITT COUNTY, TEX.

Whereas the National Guard has for 150 years provided the vital corps of this Nation's defense in time of war; and

Whereas the National Guard has likewise been the chief instrument of protection and recovery in times of natural disasters affecting our local communities; and

Whereas the National Guard provides the only means whereby the best of our young men may serve both their country and their communities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the commissioners' court of DeWitt County, Tex., That the commissioners' court of DeWitt County is unalterably opposed to the Defense Department's plans to reduce the size of the National Guard and of its local companies and that the Vice President of the United States, Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH and Congressman JOHN YOUNG be requested to exercise their best efforts to prevent such reduction.

Adopted this 16th day of May 1962 at Cuero, Tex.

STEPHEN P. HEBERT,
County Judge.

DAVE W. WEBER,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 1.
T. J. WARD,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 2.
JOE R. GRAS,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 3.
FRED DI DEAR,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 4.

Attest:

RAY GIPA,
County Clerk, DeWitt County, Tex.

RESOLUTION BY COMMISSIONERS COURT OF GALVESTON COUNTY, TEX.

Whereas the local and State units of the Texas National Guard have rendered invaluable assistance to the County of Galveston and State of Texas in time of war and in time of natural and emergency disaster; and

Whereas immediately following the Texas City disaster in 1947, the Texas National Guard performed many heroic tasks to alleviate suffering and keep order in the city of Texas City, Galveston County, Tex.; and

Whereas immediately following Hurricane Carla, the men of the Texas National Guard at great personal sacrifice helped in the emergency clearance of debris and in the maintenance of order throughout Galveston County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the county commissioners court of Galveston County do hereby go on record commending the Texas National Guard for the many services rendered to the people of the County of Galveston in both war and peace; and be it

Resolved, That the commissioners court of Galveston County does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to do everything possible to perpetuate and strengthen State and local units of the Texas National Guard; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator, the Honorable JOHN TOWER, U.S. Senator, and the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, Member of the House of Representatives.

Passed this the 14th day of May 1962.

PETER J. LA VALLS,
County Judge Galveston County.

IRVIN P. DANTIN,
County Commissioner, Precinct No. 1.
JIMMIE VACEK,
County Commissioner, Precinct No. 2.
PAUL HOPKINS,
County Commissioner, Precinct No. 3.
JACK LAWRENCE,
County Commissioner, Precinct No. 4.

Attest:

JOHN R. PLATTE,
County Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY HOUSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas in these unsettled times we live in an era fraught with continuing danger to our position of leadership in the affairs of the nations of the world and by virtue of this danger must constantly maintain adequate military security to assure the freedom of ourselves and our posterity; and

Whereas the Department of Defense now seeks to substantially reduce the manpower and units of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve thereby dissipating personnel and organizations which through devotion to duty have attained a high degree of military skill valuable to the defense of our country; and

Whereas the President of the United States has expressed a desire to raise the level of effectiveness of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve; and

Whereas since World War II, a great conflict in political ideologies, communism as against the free world, demands that we strengthen our military posture; and

Whereas the proposal of the Department of Defense to reduce the strength of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve by 58,000 trained men and more than 800 organized units is not consistent with the pronouncements of the executive department of our country that we must expect to live under the stress of the cold war for many years, and even more especially since in our opinion the cold war is a device to weaken our resistance to the point that a hot war may be successfully waged against us; and

Whereas in numerous instances the Army National Guard and Army Reserve have acted as local security forces for their communities and the elimination or weakening of any such unit in any community will deprive that community of a security and protective force with consequent loss in the capabilities of the States to carry out vital security and recovery missions, including the disaster period which could follow thermonuclear attack; and

Whereas the loss of Army National Guard units will seriously limit a community in its constitutional rights to the protection of a State militia as set forth in the second amendment of the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas testimony has been presented before the current House hearings that the Department of Defense, failing to gain approval of its plan by the Army General Staff Committee on National Guard and Army Reserve Policy and the Reserve Forces Policy Board of the Defense Department, did bypass these two Reserve Policy Boards created by law to advise the Department of Defense, in the making of the decision referred to herein. Furthermore, that when the plan was first presented to these Boards, the Reserve Forces Policy Board disapproved it and the General Staff Committee asked for delay in its execution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Houston Chamber of Commerce:

1. That any reduction in personnel or units of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve at this time be vigorously protested;

2. That Congress strongly and actively oppose any action by the Department of Defense which would reduce the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States and Army Reserve component troop basis, and that Congress prevent a decrease in the number of both personnel and units of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve by establishing a minimum requirement at the present manpower and troop basis level;

3. That the entire preamble hereof be read in the light of and constitute a distinct count of this resolution;

4. That a copy of this resolution be delivered to—

(a) Hon. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.

(b) Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States.

(c) Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense.

(d) Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Secretary of the Army.

(e) Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough, senior U.S. Senator from Texas.

(f) Hon. John G. Tower, junior U.S. Senator from Texas.

(g) Hon. Richard B. Russell, U.S. Senator, chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee.

(h) Hon. Carl Vinson, chairman, Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives.

(i) Hon. F. Edward Hébert, subcommittee chairman, House Armed Forces Committee.

(j) Hon. Albert Thomas, Member of the House of Representatives, Eighth Texas Congressional District.

(k) Hon. Bob Casey, Member of the House of Representatives, 22d Texas Congressional District.

(l) All other Texas State congressmen.

(m) Hon. Price Daniel, Governor of Texas.

(n) Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Bishop, the adjutant general, State of Texas.

(o) Rear Adm. John E. Highland, USN, national president, Reserve Officers Association of United States.

(p) Maj. Gen. William H. Harrison, Jr., president, National Guard Association of United States.

(q) Hon. Charles L. Bacon, national commander, American Legion.

(r) Maj. James Rose, president, National Guard Association of Texas.

(s) Cmdr. Oliver Majors, USNR, president, Texas department, Reserve Officers Association of United States.

(t) Hon. Lewis Cutrer, mayor, and the City Council of the City of Houston, Tex.

(u) Hon. Bill Elliott, county judge, and commissioners court of Harris County, Tex.

Adopted this 15th day of May 1962, to evidence which the signatures of the president and executive vice president of the chamber of commerce of Houston, Tex., are hereby affixed.

MANUN HUSKY,
Executive Vice President.
GEO. I. MORSE,
President.

RESOLUTION CONCERNING NATIONAL GUARD BY CITY OF CLARKSVILLE

Whereas the Department of the Army's National Guard Bureau has announced that Texas will lose about 10 percent of its company sized units under its new plan; and

Whereas we, the City Council of the City of Clarksville, Tex., fear that our unit here might be one of those lost, and we further fear that decreasing the strength of the National Guard is not wise public policy; and

Whereas the unit stationed here is of considerable economic value to the community as well as being of great value in time of disaster and other public danger; and

Whereas we consider our National Guard unit a great asset in a number of ways and think that our views should be communicated to our Senators and our Congressman: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Clarksville, Tex., That we respectfully request that the National Guard not be reduced in size as is now planned; that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Senator JOHN TOWER, and Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.

Adopted at the regular May 1962 meeting of the City Council of the City of Clarksville, Tex., this May 14, 1962.

Approved:

MAURICE WOOLEY,
Mayor.

Attest:

RUTH OWEN,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY BROWNFIELD, TEX., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the Secretary of Defense proposes to reorganize the National Guard, which reorganization provides for reduction in personnel and loss of many units of the National Guard; and

Whereas such proposed reorganization and reduction will in effect weaken and lessen the effectiveness of the National Guard as an organized force for ready action; and

Whereas our National Guard is our strongest line of defense from forces which might strike from without; and

Whereas our National Guard is a force frequently used and always prepared and ready to act in local or national uprisings from within and to use in preserving law and order and protecting and preserving life and property in local or national emergencies such as floods, tornados, fires, storms, and hurricanes; and

Whereas our National Guard is a force which has its life and support on a local or grassroot basis; and

Whereas the attempted reorganization of the National Guard will in effect further centralize and over centralize our national defense, and take from the local communities and States the privilege to participate in the defense of our country; and

Whereas the unit of our National Guard located at Lubbock and surrounding towns, including the unit at Brownfield, represent forces ready to defend, preserve, and protect the people and industry of this rapidly expanding area and its rapidly expanding industries and population, and any reduction of the units of the National Guard, if made, should be in areas where declining populations and declining industries might possibly justify: Now, therefore,

The Brownfield Chamber of Commerce, Inc., of Brownfield, Tex., wish to make it known we oppose the proposed reorganization and reduction of personnel and units of our National Guard, and we request our duly elected representatives of our State and National Government give their immediate attention to this matter and that they use their energy, influences, and offices to oppose and prevent such proposed reorganization and reduction.

Passed and adopted by Brownfield Chamber of Commerce, Inc., at meeting in Brownfield, Tex., the 4th day of April 1962, and as requested a copy hereof is herewith forwarded to our governmental officers suggested.

A. C. BISHOP.

THE CITY OF EL PASO, TEX.,
May 4, 1962.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senator from Texas, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: It concerns us greatly that there would be any reduction in force in the Texas National Guard. It has always meant a great deal to our community and to our State as evidenced during World War II. We in El Paso feel that this worthy group should be continued for the benefit of our country as well, because there are few instances where such a Ready group has not upheld the peace and honor of our country. We feel that National Guard is one of our country's greatest assets and

that they benefit each community and State. Thereby our Nation.

We respect the views of our national leaders, and we know that they have a better view of defense in Washington than we do at this level. However, we hope that every consideration will be given our request for continuation of this unit in our community and in our State. We will appreciate any consideration given to this request.

Sincerely,

RALPH E. SEITSINGER,
Mayor.

STEPHENVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Stephenville, Tex., May 17, 1962.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
House of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution, regarding our Stephenville National Guard unit, which our board of directors unanimously adopted recently. We noticed in the paper where the Department of Defense is going to move slower in this cut-back operation than first anticipated.

We believe the National Guard is a vital part of our defense evidenced by the quick mobilization of the 49th for the Berlin crisis. We had a public meeting recently at our local National Guard unit, and we had approximately 300 turn out who were vitally interested in Stephenville's keeping its unit.

We know that you are already working for our behalf, but, naturally, we are very interested in Stephenville's maintaining their unit. The enclosed is a resolution giving you a little more data about the Stephenville unit.

Thank you again for all your past considerations.

BRAD THOMPSON, President.
TOMMY LOCHRIDGE, Manager.

RESOLUTION BY CITY OF STEPHENVILLE AND
ERATH COUNTY, TEX.

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Stephenville Chamber of Commerce unanimously stands behind our local National Guard unit; and be it further

Resolved, That the new armory building and quonset-type vehicle storage building are located on 13 acres of land given the Texas National Guard Armory Board by the City of Stephenville; and be it further

Resolved, That the two buildings were constructed jointly by the State of Texas and the Federal Government at a cost of approximately \$150,000. This figure includes the paved parking area around the new armory, but does not include the value of the land; and be it further

Resolved, That the new armory was landscaped by the members of the company, in cooperation with Pair Nursery, at a cost of approximately \$500. Classroom tables, metal lockers, office chairs, pool table, cook stove, and day room furniture were also purchased by members of the company; and be it further

Resolved, That the company recently planted a pecan orchard on the north side of the new armory and shade trees on the south side of the armory at a cost of approximately \$500; and be it further

Resolved, That the city of Stephenville and Erath County hauled fill dirt and caliche for areas adjacent to both buildings. The city of Stephenville laid a sewer line to the new armory at a cost of approximately \$3,000; and be it further

Resolved, That at our 1961 Federal inspection, the Inspector General stated that the Stephenville Armory and grounds were the most attractive and best kept building and grounds in the three-State area he covered; and be it further

Resolved, That the local National Guard unit employs one full-time man. His salary

plus utilities, other expenditures by armory board, and including annual payroll for the members of the company amounts to approximately \$40,000 per year; and be it further

Resolved, That Company E has always enjoyed the reputation as one of the best trained units in the Texas National Guard. Capt. Billy F. Stafford has recently returned from active duty after completing the associate infantry officer career course at Fort Benning, Ga., and is one of the few National Guard officers qualified in nuclear weapon employment; and be it further

Resolved, That for 14 years the strength of the local unit has averaged 70 enlisted men with a full complement of officers. The unit has always worked closely with the ROTC at Tarleton State College with many college students earning extra money through membership in the National Guard.

And, be it further pointed out that the National Guard serves the surrounding towns, Dublin, Hico, Granbury, Tolar, Glen Rose, Proctor, Lingville, De Leon, Morgan Mill, Lipan, Huckaby, Comanche, Bluff Dale, Nemo, Alexander, and Carlton, by having a place for our young men to train and fulfill their military obligation.

BRAD THOMPSON,
President, Stephenville Chamber of
Commerce.

COMMUNION BREAKFAST ADDRESS BY SENATOR PASTORE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] had the honor of addressing the first annual communion breakfast of the Catholic Apostolate of Mass Media, composed of men and women of the Washington area, following their mass at historic St. Patrick's Church on Sunday, May 20.

Commissioner Robert E. Lee of the FCC presided at the breakfast which was held at the Presidential Arms.

CAMM, as the apostolate is familiarly known, was organized under the auspices of Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle and had as its honored guests the Most Rev. Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop of Washington; Rev. Msgr. Timothy Flynn, of New York, moderator of CARTA, the Catholic Apostolate of Radio, Television and Advertising, the parent group; Rev. David J. Coffey, of Providence, head of the National Catholic Broadcasting Association; Rev. William P. Anderson, moderator of CAMM; Rev. Daniel Powers, S.J., of Georgetown University; Donald H. McGannon, president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., who assisted in the formative period of CAMM; James A. Stabile, president of CARTA and vice president of National Broadcasting Co.; Attorney Thomas H. Wall, treasurer of CAMM; Joseph E. Baudino, vice president of CAMM and vice president of Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., of Washington; Hon. J. Howard McGrath, former Attorney General of the United States; Mrs. Gertrude G. Broderick, Educational Media Specialist in the Office of Education, HEW, and Senator Pastore.

Senator PASTORE's address on "The Image of America" is of such timely inspiration and real merit that I request that it be included in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE, OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE FIRST ANNUAL COMMUNION BREAKFAST OF THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLATE OF MASS MEDIA, PRESIDENTIAL ARMS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 20, 1962

Fellow Americans, I deeply appreciate the honor of sharing in the very first annual communion breakfast of the Catholic Apostolate of Mass Media. This honor is enhanced by the sincerity of your fellowship. Indeed, your little brochure reveals your sense of responsibility.

There is honor and there is humility as we join, as Catholics, in this morning of peace and reconciliation. For we are Christians and Catholics not on our own terms—but as we accept the truths laid down by the First Teacher over 1,900 years ago. These were the truths compiled and communicated by the first apostolate. Theirs was a miracle of communication.

In those days few could read. So the Gospel—the good news—had to be shouted in the markets and preached upon the streets. The apostles raced all over the known world on their mission—and their work lives after them.

Theirs was a humble beginning. Before the first Christian Pentecost with its gift of tongues there were some 120 disciples. Today in America alone 43 million Catholics will be making their way to the sacrifice of the mass.

Around the world today some 537 million Catholics will hear the same message of justice and joy. But, at this hour, justice and joy will have little meaning for much of mankind.

Put your finger blindly on any map of the world and you touch a trouble spot. The passions of the people are ready to burst into flame.

Berlin, Indochina, Suez, Iraq, Cuba, Algeria, the Congo, Bizerte, Goa, Rhodesia, Angola, Laos, Vietnam, West New Guinea, the Dominican Republic and most of Latin America.

It is almost a rollick of revolution. It seems the world map has been redrafted into an atlas of anxiety, anger, and antagonism.

Extend your hand to help any of them and some other nation is waiting to be hurt.

There is just one overtone as these new nations raise their voices to be heard. Each and all want the modern miracles of science—they demand those miracles as the basis for a better life. Upon those material blessings they are determined to build national independence and individual dignity.

There is just one undertone—which way shall they turn for their goals? Will they be with the East or the West? Their decision is fraught with danger for us. Where shall we find a balance of people to match a balance of power?

It is tiresome to deal in forecasts and figures—but not if the forecast is your future and mine—and not if the figures are so many human beings made in the image of the Creator we acknowledge this morning.

The forecast gives us something to think about.

Optimists dare to think in terms of the year 2000—40 years from now. That's not too far—40 years ago seems only yesterday.

In the year 2000 even if Communist territory doesn't expand one single square inch—their subject-people will outnumber us two and a half to one. The Communists will then have 5 billion people.

The Western nations will then possess 2 billion souls.

Where shall we find the safety cushion of 3 billion people?

We must find them in these new underdeveloped nations. They are mostly non-

whites knocking on the door of opportunity. Make no mistake—a major part of the problem will be America's, for we have the most to give—and, likewise, we have the most to lose.

How shall we persuade these new people that our way leads to self-determination and freedom—and the other way lies slavery?

How shall we communicate the character of our country? How shall we project the image of America?

That is the challenge of our times.

I feel that time works in our favor.

Wherever new nations may turn they see that the kiss of communism has meant hunger and the savagery of the police state. Only 90 miles away, the object lesson of Cuba forces that picture of poverty and peonage on our vision.

What is the image of America from the outside? A Minister of France expressed it the other night. No nation could ask a happier endorsement.

"For culture—for an Atlantic civilization—for the freedom of the mind," he said, "I offer a toast to America—the only nation that has waged war but not worshiped it—that has won greatest power in the world but has not sought it—that has wrought the greatest weapon of death but has not wished to wield it—may it inspire men with dreams worthy of its action."

This is fine language—but that is also the fact of history. We have not worshiped war or sought revenge. We forgave Japan for the butchery of Bataan—and helped a fallen foe to its feet. We have never prostituted victory nor retained conquered territory. At this hour we defend Berlin with our lives.

Out of our nuclear power we have endowed the world for peace. Atoms for peace is our pledge—and we go more than our share of the distance to disarmament.

And we dare to dream, as Americans. We dare to deserve opportunity and to grasp it. We dare to rise with no restriction of race, religion, color or creed.

We dare to dream because we possess the image of America within us—the creed of our creators—for which they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

We are Americans—not on our terms, but on the eternal truths for which they fought and died. These truths shall never be trite. We dare not hold them cheap.

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—all men are created equal—endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

These words roll like music from the lips of the schoolboy—and they must find rest and respect in the heart of every loyal citizen.

These truths shall become threadbare only as we stain their sincerity with racial distinctions—as we soil their fiber with treason—only if we foul the image of America with deeds and designs unworthy of our heritage of dignity and decency.

This must never happen. That is the responsibility of us all. But some of us bear a special responsibility because of our place in society—our place and our power.

The scientist has his responsibility—the priest—the teacher—the doctor—but none has greater responsibility than those involved in the mass media of communication.

I commend you for your understanding of that responsibility.

The spoken and written word—the idea—the advice—the philosophy—the diversion—the entertainment—the reflection of our democratic life—the communication of all these has attained new dimensions and new dangers.

Newspapers and magazines of massive circulation—the radio and television now reaching into space—all these are searching out the hearts and minds of men everywhere.

Mass communication is the master teacher. At home it molds public opinion and private life. It can inspire or impair the individual—and national character is largely in its keeping.

It helps man to know the nature of the vital struggle he is in—a struggle in which the future of freedom is the prize.

Abroad, communication sends the message of our kind of civilization—the spiritual, moral, and material advances possible under a rule of human freedom under God.

It is the tragedy of our times that science has risen to its highest and noblest at an hour when human understanding and communication are at their lowest.

We know that science has an answer for most of the problems that have always divided man. Science has a remedy for all the reasons for which nations fight.

If man wills, poverty, hunger, and disease can be plagues only of the past. There can be food aplenty for billions more. Health is to be had for the asking. There is elbowroom for all humans—material happiness—and peace.

This is our good news—our gospel. We send our Peace Corps—our food for peace—our material aid—our money—our scientists—our teachers—and we send our deeper message of hope and help as we send the image of America.

In the companionship of this morning we venture to define the American credo as recognition of God and practical love of neighbor. It is the rule of reason—it is intelligence fortified by a sense of moral responsibility.

We dare to believe that Chinese walls and iron curtains could crumble before it. We remember that the Roman Empire retreated before the Twelve.

We know that the dawn of peace will come to the world only with the sunrise of moral responsibility by men and nations.

That the world can be made moral is more than a utopian dream. It must be the goal of man. That divine command is as old as the Christian era—it is as new as the sacrifice of this morning.

That is our faith. To lose faith in that is to lose all. It is a struggle. It is a battle that cannot be fought in secrecy. It needs to be told. It needs to be shouted in the marketplace. It needs to be preached in the streets. It needs to arch the heavens to hidden hearts. It needs communication—it needs you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up the amendment designated "5-21-62-C" and ask that it be read.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, it is proposed to strike out line 17.

Beginning with line 20 on page 29, strike out all through line 9 on page 30, and beginning with line 11 on page 54, strike out all through line 6 on page 66.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana if this amendment pertains to the section of the bill which relates to the plans for wheat-production controls.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What does the amendment do? Does it strike out one of the options?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry adopted, with some amendments, the provisions which were submitted by the administration. Then an optional provision was placed in the bill which would give the farmers the opportunity to vote either for the revised bill affecting wheat or to extend the emergency provision of the wheat law for 2 years.

If the farmers decided that they did not desire the new wheat law, as proposed, they could vote for the optional plan. In a nutshell, that would mean an expenditure by the Government for the next two wheat crops after this year of almost \$350 million a year to be paid for diverted acres. That amount might be increased, depending upon the number of acres which would be diverted. At the end of the 2 years, the old law, which has given so much trouble, would then become the law again. In other words, the optional plan would not be permanent legislation by any means but would be temporary legislation. At the end of 2 years, the law which has given so much trouble in the past would be reinstated.

Before the Senate is called upon to vote on this amendment, it will be my purpose to explain again to the Senate the import of the amendment as well as to make an explanation of the new permanent program which would be in effect should the administration's proposal, as modified by the committee, be enacted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his explanation. Whatever might be the Senate's action concerning this proposal, the RECORD ought to indicate now, so that there may be proper consideration of the amendment, the purpose of the amendment.

Do I correctly understand that, ultimately, the main objective is to put the

wheat proposal into the bill along the lines proposed by the Senator from Louisiana at the time of the introduction of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. With some modifications, the Senator's statement is correct. That proposal is now in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; as one of the options.

Mr. ELLENDER. As one of the options; exactly. However, as I stated before the committee, I feel confident that the wheat farmers will be prone to vote for the so-called Mundt option, which would pay them to divert acres for 2 more years, as is the case in the emergency bill, and then to revert to the old law, which has given so much trouble.

In time, also, I hope to offer an amendment in respect to the feed grain provisions of the bill. As Senators know, and as I explained yesterday, the committee simply extended the emergency feed grain law for another year following this year; whereas, the proposal which I hope to present to the Senate will provide permanent feed grain legislation. That proposal I hope to present after the Senate has acted upon the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was not advised that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], had intended to call up the amendment which he has now had made the pending business, and therefore I am not prepared to speak on that amendment. In fact, I first saw it only a few minutes ago.

At this time I should like to speak in regard to title I of the bill, or a portion of that title, because I have very deep convictions in regard to part of that title. I believe it would be very unwise for Congress to enact into law the part of title I which relates to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. That part of Senate bill 3225 is to be found beginning in line 26, on page 4, and continues through line 22, on page 6.

Mr. President, one vice of this bill which I shall mention briefly, in passing, is that it is an omnibus bill which covers so many different features of the agricultural laws of the Nation that it is very apparent that the bill employs a method which I had hoped had been sufficiently discredited last year, when another and even larger omnibus bill for agriculture was very badly treated by both the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the corresponding committee of the other body. I had hoped that treatment had discouraged the introduction, especially so soon thereafter, of another omnibus bill covering the many different fields of agriculture which are within the purview of Senate bill 3225.

Mr. President, the objections to procedure through such an omnibus bill will occur to every Senator, I am sure. Such bills leave each Senator in the position of finding in them measures which he would like to support—measures which he thinks wise, measures which he thinks beneficial—but also finding included in

such bills measures which he believes hopelessly unwise; and, therefore, every Senator is left under the dilemma of deciding whether the wise exceed the unwise, or vice versa; and such procedure does not enable each Senator to vote on the basis of the merits of each particular issue of great importance to agriculture in the Nation—as has been the custom heretofore, in most instances.

The introduction of such an omnibus bill is in the nature of offering a carrot on a stick to each Senator, in hopes that his avid hunger for something good in the carrot may persuade him to shut his eyes to other features of the bill which he believes unwise and which he believes should not be enacted into law.

Mr. President, there is no better illustration of the lack of wisdom of the omnibus approach than title I, to which I shall address my remarks.

Title I is called "Land-Use Adjustment"; and Senators who have studied the bill know that this title involves important proposed amendments to three major agricultural laws now on the statute books—some of them having been utilized for many years.

The first major amendment proposed by means of this title is offered in section 101 to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; and this part of the bill proposes further amendments to that act. Mr. President, in my remarks I shall not concern myself primarily with that particular proposal, because I have no special objection to it, as such.

The second proposal in this title is to amend important provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act. I believe I should state for the RECORD that those provisions begin in line 26 on page 4 of the printed copy of the bill; and I shall return to a discussion of those particular features of the bill, which propose to amend the Bankhead-Jones Act, because I object very strongly to them.

The third, and still different, series of amendments proposed in title I is to be found in section 103 of that title, beginning in line 23 on page 6 of the bill; and those proposed amendments relate to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

Mr. President, there could not be a better illustration of the fact that this bill constitutes an omnibus or shotgun approach to the entire field of agriculture than that to be found by a mere inspection of title I, which proposes important amendments to three very important agricultural laws under which our people have received valuable services for long periods of time, and by which a great deal of good has been done.

I now return to a brief discussion of the amendments proposed to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, because I believe these provisions of title I of the bill are particularly unwise, and because I believe strenuous objection to them should be voiced.

Without attempting to outline all the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act, let me state that Senators will remember that it has been a very helpful act. Originally, it was designed to help ten-

ant farmers become freeholders and have farms of their own. Later, it was extended to such allied subjects as the rural housing problem of farmers who could not obtain credit from the ordinary sources, and to similar fields of activity.

I shall not here attempt to outline all the fields of activity covered by the Bankhead-Jones Act and related legislation. For instance, I have not even mentioned the field of disaster loans, in which submarginal credits are still being dealt with, because when houses are washed away or when other serious damage is done by hurricanes, storms, or floods, those who have suffered that damage are frequently unable to obtain credit from the normal sources. So without attempting to list all the fields presently covered by the Bankhead-Jones Act, I merely wish the RECORD to show at this point that that act has served very, very well in the field of extending help to those who need help, but who cannot obtain credit from the ordinary sources—whether those be commercial banks and institutions or institutions of the Farm Credit Administration; and those persons needed some special help if they were to remain independent.

By means of the amendments to the Bankhead-Jones Act which are included in title I of the bill, it is proposed to branch out into a completely different field—namely, the field of promoting the development of fishponds, dancehalls, restaurants, motels, bowling alleys, and similar activities which have to do with public recreation; and it is proposed to extend into this new field, not only in title I of the bill, but also in title IV, which makes the farmers themselves eligible to receive loans for those purposes. But the provision in title I is by far the more objectionable—making public units eligible to receive such loans for such recreational uses on a very large scale.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it true that swimming pools could be built with Federal money?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is true that swimming pools could be built with Federal loans.

Mr. EASTLAND. Golf links?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; they would be included, I think, within the range of recreational activity.

Mr. EASTLAND. Dancehalls; motels?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have already stated I think both those activities would be included within the purview of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill provides that they be open to the public. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct; those are the words used in the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that, under the interpretation which the Supreme Court places on the Constitution, these recreational facilities will be racially integrated facilities?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida so believes and would have no

hesitancy in saying that is the case. He remembers that only yesterday, when the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] was speaking on the bill, a similar question was addressed to him by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and was answered by the distinguished ranking members of the minority on our committee by saying he had no doubt in the world that integration would result, and in his opinion, that is what should result. The Senator from Florida does not go that far.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not true that we would have the U.S. Government putting up money and promoting integrated swimming pools, dance halls, and other integrated facilities all over the country?

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill, if enacted in its present form as S. 3225, would so permit. There is no question about that fact at all.

May I say, since the Senator from Mississippi has brought up this point, that the Senator from Florida had, a few years ago, some experience in this very field which he would like to relate for the RECORD at this time. The Senate had been considering an FEPC bill, and the Senator from Florida had very stoutly, along with other Senators, opposed the enactment of that bill, and it was not enacted.

Immediately after adjournment the Senator from Florida went home to the little town in Florida where he was born and still lives. Within a day or two he had a call from the chamber of commerce which is organized by and serves the Negro community in the little hometown of the Senator from Florida, and the request was made that the Senator from Florida have a conference with a committee from the Negro chamber of commerce relative to the so-called civil rights field. Of course, I was glad to grant that request.

I am very frank to say I expected to receive some friendly castigation or complaint because I had opposed the FEPC bill, which had been our business immediately prior to adjournment. To the contrary, the 3 elderly Negro citizens who comprised the members of that committee, all very fine men, whom I have known all my life, when they came to me, approached the matter from a completely different point of view.

They said, in substance, "Judge"—they still call me judge down there, Mr. President—"we are very much disturbed about one of the proposals in the civil rights program, and we want to talk it over with you." I said, "All right. I am very glad to discuss it with you. Which one is it?" They said—and here is where the surprise came to me—"It is the proposal that all public recreational and service facilities such as restaurants, hotels, pool rooms, and dance halls shall be open to people who wear the uniform of the armed services, regardless of their color or race; and, Judge, we are very much disturbed about that, because we think it will mean that our pool halls, bowling alleys, swimming pools, and other facilities of that kind will be invaded by some of the wearers of the uniform"—and I must say that they called them "poor white trash"—"and

we are just as sure that when we are invaded by some of the uniformed men of the white color, what will follow will be trouble. For instance, they may have been drinking a few beers; they will try to cut in on some of our girls who are dancing with our young men; or they will have an altercation of one kind or another, and a fight will ensue, and nobody can tell, Judge, where that kind of fight will end up. And what we are afraid of is that the people who will finally have to bear the brunt of it will be the old, established colored people who live here and who have their homes here, and whose children's homes are here, and who have found this little town a good place for our own lives and a good neighborhood to live in. We think we will be the ones who will suffer because of the trouble. We do ask you—and they made it just as plain as they could that their heart was in the request—"that you oppose in every way that you can enactment of that civil rights legislation," which was a part of the recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission, which reported, as Senators will recall, to President Truman; and a bill was subsequently offered to enact that measure into law.

I merely want to make it clear by citing this illustration that citizens whose color is not white realize the difficulties of recreational mixing of the races. Anybody who has been keeping up with troubles that have developed in the interracial field in recent years knows how many of them have come up in connection with biracial use of swimming pools and of other recreational facilities which have been used by members of both races under the integration program which is under way.

Mr. President, I had not meant to go so fully into this matter, but I do appreciate the fact that the Senator from Mississippi brought it up.

Let us come back now to the consideration of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which would now be thrust into a field highly controversial, highly welfare in its implications, quite different from the matter of serving submarginal farmers and people who have suffered from natural disaster; but, instead, which comes into the field of what the Secretary of Agriculture called, in his testimony before us, "rural renewal."

Mr. President, in his testimony before us, Secretary Freeman made a fine witness. I commend him and compliment him upon his frankness, his fairness, his willingness to answer all questions, and to make it very clear just what was the original bill which S. 3225 has replaced, and upon which he was testifying before our committee.

He made it completely clear what he meant by the term "rural renewal," which in his testimony he compared with urban renewal going on in the cities; and which he regarded as an important objective of this particular part of the bill that proposes to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. He was reminded such an amendment would carry the bill into a completely different field, and he admitted very freely, as did his counsel who was with him, and who also

testified at that meeting and later admitted, that their intention was to extend the purview and coverage of this beneficial legislation, which has benefited so many people who needed help, into the highly controversial field of development of recreational facilities and the promotion of fish, game, and wildlife.

I am speaking now of wildlife from the game concept, Mr. President, and not from the other concept, which may disturb some of the people when they think about integrated recreational facilities.

I think it would be helpful to have the RECORD show what the Department of Agriculture hoped to get, instead of what is in the bill under consideration.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, and the other members of the committee. The chairman introduced the proposed legislation, I am sure, at the request of the Department of Agriculture. The chairman and other members of our committee after we had seen how far the proposed legislation would have gone, turned thumbs down on it. The bill was rewritten generally and generously. In this particular field the rewriting was particularly generous.

Mr. President, I wish to make it very clear that the Senate has a right to consider what are the permanent objectives toward which the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture are working. Where are they trying to lead us? What is the motive or objective in the proposed amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act? What is it they have in mind?

I think that can be best shown first by quoting from the original bill some of the applicable provisions, because I wish to have them preserved in the RECORD; and, second, by quoting from the text of the remarks of the Secretary of Agriculture and of his able counsel, Mr. Bagwell, some statements before the Senate committee in the public hearing upon the original proposed measure.

Mr. President, I have already said that the original bill names Title I by the name "Land-Use Adjustment." Without going into any features of it except those dealing with the proposed amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, I wish to read into the RECORD the two proposed amendments to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which were suggested and offered with administration blessing and testified to by the Secretary of Agriculture and by his able counsel before our committee.

Section 102 of the original bill, which was S. 2786, deals with the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and reads in part as follows:

Sec. 102. Section 31 and subsections (a), (b), (c) and (e) of section 32 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (50 Stat. 525), as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 31. The Secretary is authorized and directed to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization, including the more economic use of lands and the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation, in order

thereby to correct maladjustments in land use, and thus assist in controlling soil erosion, reforestation, providing public recreation, preserving natural resources, protecting fish and wildlife, mitigating floods, preventing impairment of dams and reservoirs, conserving surface and subsurface moisture, protecting the watersheds of navigable streams, and protecting the public lands, health, safety, and welfare."

That terminates the proposed section 31. I think it might be appropriate at this time to read the portion of the hearings which deal directly with section 31. That will be found beginning on page 135 of the printed hearings of the committee. The chairman recognized the Senator from Florida to address some questions to the learned Secretary of Agriculture. I proceeded as follows:

Mr. Secretary, I have before me sections 31 and 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which are proposed to be amended by the provisions of the pending Senate bill. I want to ask you some questions as to what seems to me are the departures in those two sections from the present law.

First, with reference to section 31, I find only three additions of new words to section 31.

The reference is to the existing section 31.

I ask that counsel, Mr. Bagwell, follow this carefully.

On line 12 of the copy of the Senate bill, the words "including the more economic use of land" are new. Second, on line 16, the words "providing public recreation" are new. Third, on line 17, the words "protecting fish and wildlife" are new.

Am I correct in my understanding that those are the only three changes proposed to be made in section 31 of the present law?

Mr. Bagwell answered, rather than the Secretary, at that time. He stated:

That is correct, sir.

I continue with the next question I asked:

Am I correct in my understanding that those changes would bring about three additions to the present law? First, instead of limiting the program to "the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation" which are the applicable words in the present law, you would include the general use of the words "including the more economic use of lands."

Mr. BAGWELL. That is right. Any lands.

I then asked an additional question:

Any lands—whether they were submarginal or not, whether they were the best agricultural lands in the community or not.

Mr. BAGWELL. That is correct.

Senator HOLLAND. In the second, the second addition, is the addition of the words "providing public recreation."

Mr. BAGWELL. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. That would be a new function under the Bankhead-Jones Act not now provided.

Mr. BAGWELL. A new purpose, yes.

Senator HOLLAND. And that would apply both to submarginal lands and to any and all lands.

Mr. BAGWELL. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. And third, the words "protecting fish and wildlife" would be a description of part of what would be provided under the provision for providing public recreation; is that correct?

Mr. BAGWELL. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLAND. Mr. Secretary, do you agree with counsel that those are the three

proposed changes of section 31 of the present law?

Secretary FREEMAN. Yes, sir.

I then proceeded to ask questions about section 32.

Mr. President, I now resume the reading of the provision from the original bill, S. 2786, which proposed amendments to section 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. I quote beginning on line 22, page 4, of the print of S. 2786:

SEC. 32. To effectuate the program provided for in section 31 of this title, the Secretary is authorized—

(a) to acquire by purchase, gift, or devise, or by transfer from any agency of the United States or from any State, territory, or political subdivision, any lands, or rights or interests therein, which he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Such property may be acquired subject to any reservations, outstanding estates, interests, easements, or other encumbrances which the Secretary determines will not interfere with the utilization of such property for the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That the land purchases hereunder shall be limited to those which the Secretary determines would not have a serious adverse effect on the economy of the county or community in which the land is located;

Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I am not concluding the reading of the proposed new section 32. There are other provisions in it which any Senator may examine if he wishes. I have read only those which directly relate to the proposed change in functions of the Government, as I understand them, which would have been made by the proposed amendment to section 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. President, I shall resume reading from the printed record of hearings, at page 135. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and his counsel, Mr. Bagwell, were questioned freely, and answered freely, with reference to what was intended in section 32 as proposed to be modified by his bill:

Senator HOLLAND. Now, with reference to section 32, which I have before me, there are more places where changes occur, as I see it, but I think the principal place will be found in the two bottom lines on page 4, and the three top lines on page 5. They read as follows:

"(a) To acquire by purchase, gift, or devise, or by transfer from any agency of the United States or from any State, territory, or political subdivision, any lands, or rights or interests therein, which he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title."

That is not limited to submarginal lands.

Mr. BAGWELL. No, sir; that is where you get authority for any lands.

Senator HOLLAND. That means that any lands, whether belonging to State, city, county, or individual may be acquired by the Secretary.

Mr. BAGWELL. That is right.

Senator HOLLAND. And am I also correct in my understanding that the general terms used there "to acquire by purchase, gift, or devise," when coupled with other provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act, allow the use of condemnation by the Secretary for the purpose of such acquisition?

Mr. BAGWELL. They would permit the Secretary to invoke the general condemnation statute, as is true today for authorized acquisitions.

Senator MUNDT. Is that the meaning of the word "devise"?

Senator HOLLAND. No, devise is by will. But the point I am making, if I may say, is that these words, part of them are already in the present law, along with title III of the present law, and allow the use of condemnation in carrying out the purposes of the present law.

The big difference, however, appears after that place. The present law limits that acquisition in the following words: "Land not primarily suitable for cultivation." In other words, any acquisition that could be accomplished under the present law would be land not primarily suitable for cultivation; whereas under the proposed law, the words are "any lands or rights or interests therein which he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title."

Am I correct in my understanding that this section 32 would permit in a complete way the carrying out of the purposes outlined in section 31?

Mr. BAGWELL. That is correct.

Mr. President, I shall not impose upon Senators or encumber the RECORD by quoting more fully from the record, except as to one point. I think it is important to understand that the able Secretary, in going into this subject, had no understanding at all to the effect that he had the right of condemnation. That point came out freshly in the hearings following questions asked by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

As shown on page 123 of the record, the Secretary had just reached the discussion of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act changes. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] interrupted, with the approval of the chairman:

Senator TALMADGE. May I interrupt at that point and ask a few clarifying questions. Is it proposed to give the Secretary the right of eminent domain in this bill—could he condemn certain farms as he sees fit?

Secretary FREEMAN. No, sir; I do not think that is authorized. I am corrected by general counsel.

Senator TALMADGE. In other words, he could condemn farms and acquire title thereto. Do you have any idea how much land may be acquired under such authority?

Secretary FREEMAN. I think that it would be very, very little. What we are oriented toward in this primarily is an effort at some pilot projects directed toward rural renewal possibilities.

I have been intrigued, Senator, with observing what has been done in some of the big cities in urban renewal, which is done through local governmental units with Federal assistance—slum clearance. It has appeared to me that it would be highly desirable if the same kind of purchase redevelopment and resale could be done in rural areas by way of renewal, as well as urban. We would like to experiment with this on a pilot basis.

On the following page, page 124, the question arose as to what purpose may be served under the loans to be made:

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Mr. Secretary, under that title, is there any limitation as to the amount of land that could be designated by one landowner? In other words, could he develop all he had, or is there any limitation as to amount that could be loaned to him for carrying out the purposes of title I?

Secretary FREEMAN. The limitation is directed to the provision that land should not be acquired by the Government that would have an adverse effect on the community in question. To read specific language—

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that. But I am talking about as to what you can do for a particular farmer.

Secretary FREEMAN. No, there is no set limitation as to what could be done for a particular farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, would it be possible for the Government to loan to a farmer money so that he can build, let us say, swimming pools, golf courses, artificial lakes, summer resorts, hunting lodges, and things of that kind?

Secretary FREEMAN. It would be possible as a part of an overall program that a farmer might develop just as he goes in for an FHA loan now. In other words, it would be a proposal that would be consistent with the income objectives and the economic operation of that farm, and if there was assurance of proper management and repayment of the loan—and of course that the funds were not available from private sources.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], whom I am glad to see present in the Chamber, then made a very great contribution to the record in this case by a question:

Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question: How much land do you contemplate taking out of production?

Secretary FREEMAN. The goal that we had set, that we have estimated, Senator, would be that by the year 1980, on a 20-year basis, it is our best estimate that we will need 50 million acres less in cropland than we have today. This would be a long-term program which contemplated initially, as the President's message pointed out, that there would be some pilot projects on a very limited basis, to see just how this would work, and then to expand it proportionately with the goal of directing to alternative uses, by 1980, approximately 50 million acres.

Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. Would this 50 million acres be in addition to what we already have out of production under the soil bank and under the present retirement programs, under the feed grain and wheat programs? Would this be in addition?

Secretary FREEMAN. It would be in addition to the conservation reserve. It would not be in addition to the land which has been directed to soil-conserving purposes under the emergency programs.

Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. That would be in the neighborhood of about 80 million acres, then.

Secretary FREEMAN. If you included the conservation reserve, it would be about 80 million acres, yes, sir.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that there are approximately 28 million acres of land in the conservation reserves?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that figure is substantially correct. I believe that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] referred to it as substantially 30 million acres. The Senator is present in the Chamber. I shall be glad to yield to him, if I may, so that he may answer the question.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The number of acres in the conservation reserve last year was approximately 30 million. There is land coming out of soil bank now and more will come out unless the law is extended.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is envisioned to get 50 million acres into the new program.

Mr. HOLLAND. In addition to the 30 million. What the Secretary was talking about was the overall elimination from production. Within that figure is

included whatever was his direct objective under the act. I would not want the RECORD to make it appear that he said that the 50 million acres was to be handled solely under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act, which is only one of the measures under which the proposed law would function.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator will concede that the power of the Secretary to purchase this land has been entirely removed; it has been taken out.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to concede it. Only a few minutes ago, when the Senator from Louisiana was called out of the Chamber, I stated for the record that he was one of those who were actively insisting that the power of condemnation be stricken out of the bill. I also stated that the bill now before us, S. 3225, represents a rather complete rewriting of the original bill, which was S. 2786. I also stated that perhaps the most generous rewriting of all was done with reference to title I. I am ready to be corrected on those statements if they are not correct.

I stated it was my belief that probably the most generous rewriting of all by the committee staff, under the direction of the chairman, was with reference to title I.

However, I am going to show what I think are the very bad things still in title I. I have already called attention to the fact that we are deliberately beginning a program, if we pass the bill, which envisions this immense empire of recreational facilities to be developed and operated by the Secretary of Agriculture, as was shown in the original bill. While the rewriting of the bill has clipped spurs very greatly, nevertheless, if we proceed here in the way it is proposed that we proceed, we are letting the camel get its nose under the tent flap, with the full knowledge of just what the Department of Agriculture wants to do and what it envisions it can do in this field if it is given the authority for which it originally asked, a part of which would be left to the Department under the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a little correction?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not mean, of course, that the Department of Agriculture would operate it. In the bill it is provided that the local interests would do it, not the Department of Agriculture. The Department is out of it altogether.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Louisiana is correct in so far as the operation goes, under the rewritten bill. I have already stated that the rewriting of title I was a very generous rewriting. I am stating, and I stand on this statement, that we know what the objectives of the Secretary of Agriculture are, because they were stated in the original bill. They were stated by his testimony and the testimony of the general counsel for the Department of Agriculture, from which statements I have read as they appear in the record. If we begin this greatly modified, greatly abbreviated part of the original program, we are do-

ing so with firm knowledge of the fact that we are granting only a first step on the stairway which leads a great deal further up than our committee has been willing to recommend we go. We are doing it with knowledge of the fact that when we once give one of these administrative agencies one part of what they are asking for, knowing what the general objective is, we are embarking on a very dangerous course of action.

I say that because they will have a chance to develop and recommend and to show a beautiful showcase of something that they believe amply justifies what they have attempted. We know so clearly what has happened in the past.

I call the chairman's attention to the Small Watershed Act, for example. We were careful in the original hearings on that act; and in the original discussion in our full committee and in the passage of the original act, to restrict quite greatly the size of the program and the kind of contributions to the program which would be required from local people before small watershed proposals could be developed.

That original objective has been departed from so greatly in both respects, both as to the size of the projects and the amount of the contribution now required, that I believe it is a fair illustration of how we drift when once we start into a program and turn it over to administration by a bureau which wants to go a great deal further.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know whether my questions will be germane to the subject that the Senator from Florida is discussing, but there are some questions that I should like to have answered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How many acres were taken out of production under the corn and feed grain program?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answers would be only approximate, because I am not prepared to give exact figures. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the able chairman of the committee, who has the figures in hand, so that he may answer the question of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator refer to corn and other feed grains, as well as wheat; both together?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The figures are in the report. For corn, the final diverted acres for the 1961 feed grain program were 19,141,067 acres.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the average cost per acre?

Mr. ELLENDER. Thirty-one dollars, plus.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Getting to the conservation reserve program, in which there are 30 million acres, what was the average cost per acre of those 30 million acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. That was more in the nature of rental.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is right; rental.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the rental was about \$11-plus.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, on 30 million the cost was \$11 an acre to take them out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the 19 million acres the cost was what?

Mr. ELLENDER. \$31 an acre. That is, on diverted acres. That is to repay the farmer for the profits he would have made had he planted the corn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the difference between the two?

Mr. ELLENDER. With respect to the diverted acres, the farmer had no right to plant any commodity that was in surplus. However, it was specifically stated in the act that he could plant certain crops. They were safflower, guar, sunflower and other commodities that were not in surplus but that were needed. The diverted acres had to remain idle otherwise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the old conservation reserve program, what was the situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. Grasses or other vegetative cover had to be planted, or trees had to be planted, or the land had to be put to other conserving use, depending on the contract entered into between the farmer and the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And not used at all for production?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it true that under the new program greater latitude is given to the farmer than was given under the conservation reserve program?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not say that. It is not greatly different. He could not plant any kind of crops that were in surplus. He could not make hay on it, or anything else which might impair the program. He could not plant grain of any kind. He could not graze.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He could not do that under the conservation reserve program, either.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Just grass and other conserving uses. Of course, as far as planting crops is concerned, he could not do that either.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why is there that difference in cost, between \$31 per acre and \$11 an acre?

Mr. ELLENDER. The \$31 rate was for diverting acres from feed grains, so as to cut the surpluses in the production of corn and other feed grains. Of course, in order to induce farmers to take that step it was necessary to pay more than under the conservation reserve program, which was more or less on a rental basis and which took out of cultivation lands that were not as productive as the land, which was taken out under the corn and other feed grain program, and which did not require the farmer to reduce his feed grain acreage.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Initially the very sparsely cultivated land was put in these programs. As that sparsely cultivated land ran out—

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what happened in the conservation program. That is what happened. It was intended that that should happen. But in the programs to divert land from the production of wheat, corn, and other feed

grains, some of the best farmland is being diverted. In order to induce the farmer to divert his land from production, the program must be made attractive.

I may say in passing that I have been opposed to an extension of the program for another year, particularly as it affects wheat and as it will affect corn and other feed grains. I have pending an amendment which will make permanent the proposal which was originally in the bill and will do away with the expensive special emergency programs.

(At this point Mrs. NEUBERGER took the chair.)

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the total cost to the Government of taking the 18 million acres out of production?

Mr. ELLENDER. About \$782 million, plus \$43 million for administration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the farmers received about \$800 million?

Mr. ELLENDER. Just under \$800 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much was farm income increased this year over last year?

Mr. ELLENDER. About \$1,500 million gross.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of the \$1,500 million, practically \$800 million of the taxpayers' money was put into the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct; but I point out that 421 million fewer bushels of corn and sorghums were produced, and barley, oats, and rye production decreased by 180 million bushels; so more storage would have been required except for the program. Except for the program, it might have been necessary to store as many as 800 million or 900 million bushels.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much was the soybean production increased?

Mr. ELLENDER. 137 million bushels.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was there an increase in the production of some other farm products?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, not that I know of. At least not in any of the feed grains. Of course, the Farm Bureau, as was stated by the Senator from Florida yesterday, added soybeans to the corn, which is unrelated to what the committee originally tried to do. When I say "unrelated," it is because the Secretary of Agriculture could accomplish what he desired without any further legislation in regard to soybeans.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Ohio. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he merely wished to point out by quoting rather liberally from the original act and by quoting from the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, and his able General Counsel, exactly what the objective is.

We shall move only partially to that objective by means of the bill reported by the committee, but by no means unanimously reported from the committee. I think the Senate is entitled to know that this is a first step toward a grandiose scheme. I do not mean that that is intended by the chairman and the majority of the committee who support the bill, but that this grandiose scheme is in part broken down, and that

this is the first step, which I am sure the able chairman of the committee hopes will be the last step we take. Perhaps he hopes we will not take enough steps in the first stage to approach the grandiose objective which was unfolded to the committee in the original bill and in the testimony on it.

Let us go back to the committee bill, S. 3225, again with the statement that it by no means represents the attitude of the full committee. My own feeling is that if the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee with reference to the feed grain program and the wheat program were adopted, it would represent the views of a minority of the committee. As reported, and containing the provisions relating to feed grains and wheat, the bill represents a substantial majority feeling of the committee. As I recall, only four members of the committee opposed it; but a majority of the committee had already stricken from the bill substantial provisions which are sought to be reincorporated by the amendment now offered by the chairman of the committee relative to feed grains and relative to wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida, just to keep the record straight, that I have criticized emergency programs in the discussion I had with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. The first amendment which the Senate will be asked to pass upon would eliminate the extension of the emergency programs now in the bill. As Senators know, these have been very costly.

Included in the wheat provisions of the bill is an optional plan which would include the so-called emergency program, which costs about \$350 million a year. This would be an extension for 2 more years; then there would be a reversion to the same old law that has given so much trouble. I am trying to have the Senate adopt a permanent wheat program, a program which will do away with the excessive production of wheat which now exists.

If the Senator from Florida will read the RECORD, he will learn from the statement I made yesterday that in 1938 an amendment was placed in the law which prevented the Secretary of Agriculture from setting the national allotment under 55 million acres regardless of stocks. I am trying to be more realistic and to have that acreage reduced to conform to present needs. That is the purpose of the amendment which is pending before the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was the statement just made by the Senator from Louisiana in connection with the discussion in the RECORD that the bushelage production per acre was about 14 bushels—

Mr. ELLENDER. Thirteen point three bushels per acre in 1938.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And it is now what amount?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is now 26.2 bushels, and the minimum number of acres has not been changed. I am trying to reduce the minimum. I am proposing that, instead of using acreage, the Secretary of Agriculture may fix a minimum

quota of 1 billion bushels, which is about what is needed for domestic uses and export sales.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, in view of the chairman's statement concerning a permanent wheat program, I desire to make a short statement. I think it is a matter of record and is well known by all that for many years I have been trying to have adopted a domestic parity price program which would be a permanent program. I still hold to that position. I sincerely hope that a program of that kind can be included in the bill.

Coming from a State which produces one-fourth of the wheat grown in the Nation, I question seriously and with sincerity the desirability of a permanent wheat program such as that proposed by the Senator from Louisiana. Wheat is now being harvested in the Middle West. In 10 days, Kansas wheat will be on the market. Optimistic as the chairman might be, he does not expect this bill to be passed within another 2, 3, or 4 weeks.

In my opinion, a new permanent program will require much education. I do not say there should be a 2-year program or a choice between two programs; but I sincerely hope the farmers of the Nation may be given some time to consider the proposal. If the present program is continued for another year, it will be possible to sell the new program to the farmers of the Nation. They simply cannot learn the complexities of the bill in a short time. The new proposal is too complicated to be put into effect without some time for study. That is one reason.

The second reason is that we in the Middle West have had some outstanding years of wheat production. In the 4 years 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961 Kansas grew more than 1 billion bushels of wheat, or an average of 250 million bushels a year. This year Kansas is suffering from a drought. I sincerely hope it will not be a serious condition, but present indications are that the production of wheat will be reduced probably to less than 200 million bushels. I think it is well to remember that sometimes we grow short crops; and when Kansas grows short crops of wheat, so does Oklahoma, so does Nebraska, and so even does North Dakota.

In 1917, Kansas grew 42,785,000 bushels of wheat. In 1918, we grew 97 million bushels of wheat; in 1923, 83 million bushels; in 1925, 80 million bushels; in 1933, 66 million bushels; in 1934, 84 million bushels; and in 1935, 64 million bushels.

I sincerely hope that does not happen again; but if it does, the 1,300 million bushels of wheat we are talking about now will disappear very rapidly.

Today, Canada is practically out of the world market for wheat; and Argentina is out of it.

Today, appeals have been made to Senators, in the interest of providing wheat to starving Chinese. I am very much in favor of providing wheat for that purpose.

But, Madam President, I conceive grave danger to our food supply if we do not provide some kind of adjustment; and I sincerely hope the farmers of the Nation will be given an opportunity, as provided by the committee, to have a choice as between these two programs.

But, if not, I hope they will be given 1 year during which to decide whether to come under this program. In fact, the Senator from Florida will remember that in 1954 we passed, by a vote of 54 to 32, a parity bill which we had introduced in the Senate. So I am not unfamiliar with this field.

I should like to have a parity program established; but it would be disastrous to put the farmers under a program with which they cannot become familiar in a month or two. They will soon start planting their wheat seed beds; and, first, they should know about this program.

So I wish to point out, first of all, the grave danger to the food basket of the country; and, second, I wish to state that if we are to have a start made on a new program, the farmers should be given an opportunity to learn of its ramifications, and should be given time to become educated in regard to it.

I favor a new program.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Kansas. He has made a great contribution to the discussion of this matter, not only in connection with the wheat question, which he has discussed with such wide knowledge and clear grasp, but also in connection with the point I made at the beginning of my remarks—namely, that such an omnibus approach to this matter is dangerous and is not fair to those concerned.

Madam President, S. 3225 contains several different approaches. One is in regard to wheat, and now it is proposed to be amended by means of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The wheat provisions are completely different from the feed-grains provisions and so on, through the bill. This procedure is nothing but the use of the carrot on the stick technique—and I emphasize that I am not referring at all to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana—in an effort to get Senators to support provisions which they know are not acceptable to their constituents, or which they believe will not operate to the good of the Government.

Madam President, I should like to refer now, briefly, to Senate bill 3225, as reported by the committee. I believe it very clear that, except in two particulars, the bill provides merely a different approach to the title I provision of the original bill, which I have already discussed at some length.

There are two particulars in which title I of the committee bill, S. 3225, puts to rest some very bad features of the original bill. One of them is in regard to the condemnation acquisition of property. That was provided by the original bill, but is done away with in this rewrite.

The second is the operation of the recreational units by the Secretary of Agriculture, according to his sole dis-

cretion. That, too, is done away with by the new proposal.

The third deals with the amounts which can be used in the program. A little later, I shall discuss this in more detail.

If Senators will turn to page 4, line 26, of the committee bill, S. 3225, they will find, beginning there with section 102, provisions which modify the same sections of the existing Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act as those which were intended to be modified by the original bill—namely, sections 31 and 32. In other words, there is no abandonment of the principle that the Bankhead-Jones Act is to be amended so as to cover the development of recreational facilities along a very generous line, although not to be obtained by condemnation—at least, not by the Federal Government—and not to be operated under the sole discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. Those two changes are made, and they are very useful changes. I have already commended the distinguished chairman of the committee for making them, and I do so again. But once more I call attention to the fact that that proposed departure in objective from the very salutary objectives heretofore served by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act still remains in the rewritten sections 31 and 32.

The rewritten section 31 begins in line 3, at the top of page 5; and the rewritten section 32 begins in line 17, on the same page.

Madam President, I wish to state—and here I pause, in order to provide an opportunity for the distinguished chairman of the committee to correct me if I am at all in error in making this statement—that the original objective of changing land use, and of changing it particularly from the standpoint of the development of recreational activities, which are just as broadly defined in this version of the measure as in the original measure—is not abandoned, but it is continued under the present modified sections 31 and 32 in the committee's version of the bill.

If Senators wish to check on that matter, they will find that in lines 5 and 6, on page 5, in addition to providing for "the retirement of lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation," as provided in existing law, there are also included the words "including the more economic use of lands." And Senators will find, later on, the words "to correct maladjustments in land use"; those words are to be found in lines 7 and 8.

Then the provision for public recreation is amended—and I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for the amendment—so as to confine the Secretary of Agriculture to "enabling local public authorities to provide public recreation"—whereas the original bill endowed the Secretary of Agriculture with that power, to be exercised on his own initiative; and the words "protecting fish and wildlife," which were in the original measure, still are retained.

If Senators then will turn to section 32(e), as proposed to be modified by means of the committee version of the

bill—it begins on page 5, in line 17—they will find that the section is rewritten so that the objective shall be—"to cooperate with Federal, State, territorial, and other public agencies in developing plans for a program of land conservation and land utilization, to assist in carrying out such plans by means of loans to State and local public agencies designated by the State legislature or the Governor, to conduct surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing most effectively the purposes of this title, and to disseminate information concerning these activities."

Without reading the rest of the proposed modified section 32, Madam President, I wish to call attention now to the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture will still have the power, on his own initiative—and now I refer to lines 24 and 25 and the following—to initiate the surveying of projects and the working up of projects, so that, in turn, the local public agencies can be interested in them.

I quote the words that have that meaning—"to conduct surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing most effectively the purposes of this title, and to disseminate information concerning these activities."

In other words, there is taken away by this rewritten bill the power of the Secretary to condemn and to operate, but there is still left in the Secretary, by the use of Federal funds, the power to make surveys at any place where there are appropriate sites for what he calls rural renewal, and for development of an economy that is different from that which prevailed in the community, by adapting lands to recreational use or the propagation of fish, wildlife, and the like.

I do not think we have to guess what the activities of the Department of Agriculture will be under that sort of arrangement. The Department will be developing plans and programs and propagandizing them, because it will be specifically authorized not only to make the surveys, but, once made, to disseminate information concerning them. I can see the agents and advocates of "rural renewal," as the Secretary calls it, developing programs in various rural communities of this Nation, and then endeavoring to sell the local public authorities upon the wisdom of undertaking those activities.

That is a power we should not give; and, if we give it, we should do so knowing that it is a long step toward the fulfillment of the objective so clearly announced by the Secretary and by the original bill. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he will never vote for this bill with that provision remaining in it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To which specific part does the Senator from Florida object? To section 31 or section 32, or both?

Mr. HOLLAND. I object to both, I may say to the able Senator, but the point I was making at that time was that I particularly object to leaving to the

Secretary the power of initiative to send his surveyors and agents out and to conduct surveys; if I may read the language of the bill as reported by the committee "to conduct surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing most effectively the purposes of this title, and to disseminate information concerning these activities."

All this is to be at Federal expense.

Incidentally, such amounts might be appropriated as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and objectives of these sections. There is no limit on the amount.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. After the Secretary conducts these "surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing most effectively the purposes of this title," and after he disseminates the information concerning these activities, is there then vested in the Secretary of Agriculture the power to lend money to carry out what the Department thinks ought to be done by way of making this land available?

Mr. HOLLAND. The answer is "Yes." Of course, the loan would be made by the Farmers Home Administration, which is one of the agencies in the Department of Agriculture, and be made subject to a condition, and I think this should appear in the Record, and I will read the next sentence:

Loans to State and local public agencies shall be made only if such plans have been submitted to, and not disapproved within 45 days by, the State agency having supervisory responsibility over such plans, or by the Governor if there is no such State agency.

In other words, after the plans have been adopted and after the propaganda has been devised, the propaganda is submitted then to the State agency, or, if there is not such an agency, to the Governor, and if it is not turned down within 45 days, the Secretary is released to make the loans allowed for under the act.

I was just getting down to the amounts of those loans. That comes in the next sentence:

No appropriation shall be made for any single loan under this subsection in excess of \$250,000 unless such loan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

In other words, the Secretary can lend up to \$250,000 in the event the loans were not disapproved within 45 days by the approved State agency, or by the Governor. In any event, he could lend up to \$250,000 to the local public unit or State for the purpose of going forward with the development. After the fulfillment of those conditions, the loan is apparently unlimited. The amount of the loan would be unlimited except by the amount of the appropriations which would have been made available to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Here is another point in the bill which I want every Senator to understand—that while loans up to \$250,000 can be made by the Secretary in his own judgment and without submission to anybody, unlimited amounts of loans, limited only by the appropriations and amounts available, can be made for one of these objectives. We are talking about public units and States, and not of private individuals, farmers or land owners.

I understand the provision means just that, and I am so advised by able counsel for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has been discussing the authority given to the Secretary to make these plans. That is not new authority. The Secretary now has the right to cooperate in developing plans, and to conduct surveys and investigations. If the Senator will look at page 60 of the report, at the bottom of the page, he will note, under (e), the words "to cooperate"—that is, the Secretary—"with Federal, State, territorial, and other public agencies in developing plans for a program of land conservation."

That is already the law. What we have added here is included on page 59 of the report, under section 31, appearing in italics. We have added, on the second and third lines, "the more economic use of lands and," and in the sixth line, "enabling local public authorities to provide public recreation."

It will be noted the Federal Government has the right to provide any kind of plans in order to find a proper program for conservation and utilization with respect to submarginal lands. That is already included in the law. I wanted to call that to the attention of the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. As the Senator has just pointed out, the change made in section 31 increases the authority of the Secretary under section 32 to make plans. That is my point. I am advised by our counsel for the committee that the provision which the Senator has just read from the existing provision of section 32 is now limited by the existing language of section 31 to, and I quote section 31, "lands which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation"; whereas under rewritten section 31 no such limitation exists. That is one of the reasons for my objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the authority for plans and programs is already provided for in the law, again I point out. The right to form them is already provided by law. That is in section 32(e). We would not change that. That would still be in the law. But in the future they could be made with respect to lands which are not submarginal.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, planning authority now extends only to submarginal lands and lands not suitable for conservation, whereas under the law proposed it would not be so limited. A local agency which wished to have a program and required money for the acquisition of lands—whether for the ac-

quisition of the best nursery in the community at a desirable spot, or a small industry, or residences of people who have lived there for many years—could make plans which could encompass the inclusion of such territories. Then the Secretary of Agriculture would be permitted to lend up to \$250,000, without submitting the proposal to the committees of the Congress; and there would be no limitation upon the authority other than the amount of appropriations if the committees of the Congress approved.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator will concede that the loans are to be made to State or local agencies.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the conditions the Senator has related.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And they are to be secured, and the going rate of interest is to be paid to the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The difference between that and the present law is that the present law deals—and very rightly so—with a limitation to submarginal lands. I am glad that the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act has been limited to dealing with submarginal lands and people who cannot go to the regular banks for their credit, who cannot go to the Farm Credit Administration to get loans. Such people frequently own the submarginal lands. The present law is confined to the less attractive credits, to the less attractive lands, and the less stable people.

It is proposed by the bill to completely convert the coverage of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to go into the new field in such a way as, I think, to give promise before very long of going as far as the Secretary suggested and recommended and testified to in the hearing before our committee, and as included in the original bill.

I hasten to add again that the able Senator from Louisiana, with a majority of the committee, has insisted upon very generously rewriting the original bill so as to make the bill now before us less dangerous than the original form.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To what purpose may the money be put? Would it be used for the development of facilities, or could the money be used for the acquisition of land?

Mr. HOLLAND. It could be used for development, or for the acquisition of lands indirectly. Let us suppose that the unit had enough money to acquire all the other lands it needed except for some most valuable portion. The bill as presented to us would permit the lending of an unlimited amount, which might be approved by the committees, out of money already appropriated, for the purpose of perfecting the program and going ahead with it.

What would be withheld is the right of Federal condemnation. There would be no withholding of the right of local condemnation through the local agencies. Condemnation might have to be

resorted to. There is to be no attempt to deal with that, and there should not be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, if the Senator from Florida is correct, the money might be used for the development of facilities or for the acquisition of land, either from private owners or from the land owned by the Federal Government now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; or from land owned by the State, or by the city, or by the community. The Secretary of Agriculture clearly testified, as did his counsel, that the wording of the original bill—that part of the wording is in the rewritten bill—would permit the acquisition of lands from various local units of government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his questions.

Madam President, I have adverted to two of the very dangerous things which are proposed to be left in the section 32, after calling attention to the fact that section 31 as rewritten in the committee bill would retain all the objectionable features of the original section 31 except for operation by the Federal Government.

With reference to loans which can be made to the individual farmers, I understand that subject is covered by a different section of the bill, appearing at pages 66 and 67, in General Provisions. The reason for that is that the loans to ordinary farmers under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act have been transferred under the bill which was enacted only last year, which was a very great liberalization of the Farmers Home Administration authorities, called the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. I understand from counsel for the committee that \$60,000 is the maximum amount of any loan which can be made to an individual under that provision. Direct loans can be made to associations under that provision, with a limit of \$500,000. The limit on the loans to an association which may be insured is \$1 million.

We are talking about big money. We are talking about grandiose plans. We are talking about setting on the road toward an objective which was fully disclosed and frankly disclosed to our committee. It is a program which, if given this beginning, which is a sizable one, will, I think, rise to plague the country and to plague everyone who votes for it.

Madam President, I have not sought to deal in these brief remarks with the other provisions in the bill having to do with feed grains, having to do with wheat, having to do with the surplus disposal program, having to do with other aspects of the agricultural laws of our Nation.

I think the bill is the most perfect example since last year of the vice of attempting to deal, through an omnibus bill, with unrelated and numerous different provisions of agricultural law, not all applicable to the same persons or to the same groups, but applicable in their entire coverage to almost all the citizens

of this country. I do not think that is a reasonable way to deal with the law.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has dealt in his discussion only with the proposed enlargement and the proposed change in direction of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and its successor in certain fields, the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

I think there are enough troublesome points arising in connection with these items alone in the bill to justify every Senator's rejecting the bill and insisting that the measures be approved in a regular way, through bills which deal separately with great agencies which are spending or investing literally hundreds of millions of dollars of the public money a year.

Madam President, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been very generous in its treatment of the Farmers Home Administration. The Senator from Florida happens to be the chairman of the subcommittee which deals with that subject. Another member of the subcommittee on the floor at this time is the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. Our subcommittee on two occasions in the recent past studied the subject and reported very real liberalizations and enlargements of the coverage of the Farmers Home Administration Act. I am glad we did. I think those changes made it more serviceable.

I have no doubt that other changes will be expected, as our country moves along, and they may be made in the regular way. If a bill is offered and studied by the subcommittee and by the full committee, I think the administrators will find that they will have the sympathy of those who will pass upon the measures before they reach the floor of the Senate or of the other body.

Madam President, I object strenuously to a shotgun approach by which we would try to cure ills in a dozen different fields of agriculture by amendments stuck together in one bill. It is not possible to reach sound results with that kind of approach.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I wish to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I understand that he has proposed, will propose, or has filed, three amendments to the bill. Is that statement correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have offered two amendments, one which would affect wheat, and the other corn and other feed grains.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One would reinstate the choices in the wheat referendum.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under the proposed program, if farmers in a referendum should oppose the certificate plan, price supports would then be not in excess of 50 percent of parity.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator refers to the amendment now pending, which would affect the wheat program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would remove from the bill the so-called emergency program, and would write into the law permanent wheat legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The second amendment would replace the temporary extension of the feed grain program with a permanent feed grain program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. That proposal will be presented later. It is now lying on the table. I hope to present it after the Senate completes consideration of the amendment relating to wheat.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator from Louisiana propose an amendment which would reinstate the provision for growing wheat on feed grain acres and feed grain on wheat acres?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Instead of dealing with the question separately, it is already covered in my feed grain amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A great number of people in the Pacific Northwest who are active in farm organizations such as the Grange and the Farmers' Union have consulted my colleague [Mr. JACKSON] and me. He joins me in this statement because he could not be present at this time. We have been urged to support the so-called Ellender amendments. After discussion with various interested groups, we intend to do so.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture and signed by 26 Senators from wheat-growing States, which in the main sustains the approach of the Senator from Louisiana in the wheat program field. The letter follows out a suggestion made by us in a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture several weeks ago.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The necessity to include temporary stopgap wheat legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1961, clearly demonstrates the need for early consideration by Congress of a permanent wheat program for the 1963, and succeeding crop years.

We recognize the problems which were faced by the Congress at the start of this session, which justified the necessity for such a temporary program.

It is our firm conviction, however, that it is of paramount importance that recommendations for a workable, permanent wheat program be submitted to Congress by January 1, 1962, in order that the Congress will have time to develop such a program prior to the time wheat producers start making their plans for fall seeding.

It is our understanding that by April 1, seeded preparations are under way in much of the wheat-producing area. Therefore, any program to be effective must be enacted by that date.

Many of us jointly sponsored a bill in the 86th Congress, S. 3159, which we believe is the answer to the perennial wheat problem. This bill would establish wheat quotas on a bushel basis, instead of an acreage basis, as has been the custom in past years.

Such an approach has many advantages over the acreage approach. First and foremost, it provides a mechanism for an orderly reduction in CCC stocks, and shifts the re-

sponsibility for storage of any surplus production from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the individual producer, thus resulting in significant savings to the American taxpayer.

Secondly, and almost of equal importance, it will encourage the production of higher quality wheat. Under present acreage programs, a producer has a market for all of the production on his allotted acres—either to the trade or the Commodity Credit Corporation. Thus his incentive is to produce the maximum number of bushels on his allotment. In contrast, under the bushel program, each producer has a limited number of bushels to sell into the market for food and export. Thus his incentive is to produce the highest quality possible in order to receive the most dollars for this limited quantity.

In a similar manner, since only a limited volume of wheat will flow through trade channels, warehousemen and subterminal operators will tend to select the highest quality possible to ship forward to mills or exporters. This would be a big step forward in upgrading the wheat moving into world markets, and thus increase demand for U.S.-grown wheat.

For these reasons, we strongly urge that your Department develop, under the procedures provided by the Agricultural Act of 1961, recommendations for a comprehensive long-range wheat program, embodying the principles of the bushel program, in sufficient time to submit your recommendations to the Congress by January 1962.

Respectfully,

(The letter was signed by a bipartisan group of 26 Senators from wheat-growing States.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I am glad to say that the Senator from Washington was one of the original proponents of a two-price system.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. He has been working for many years on such a program. I am hopeful that the Senate will adopt the program now before it as a permanent program. It would make no sense to require that farmers vote on an option plan which, 2 years hence, might make us go back to the old law, which has given us so much trouble.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Operation under the provisions of the old law is or would be much more costly than under the present proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is. There is no question about it.

Mr. BURDICK. Madam President, it is my belief that the amendments proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], dealing with feed grains and a wheat certificate plan, should be adopted.

The feed grain amendment would give producers the right to choose a supply management program that would bring stability to their farming operations at reduced cost to the Government.

As for wheat, the deletion from the bill of the option to continue the present temporary program is necessary, because it could defeat the goals of improving farm income and reducing Government costs.

Under the Benson farm programs and policies of the 1950's the farmer saw his net income decline steadily—year after year—even though in each succeeding year he worked harder, planted more acres, milked more cows, spent more money for fertilizer, and improved seed

and machinery. In productivity and efficiency, the American farmer became the envy of a world where lack of adequate food and fiber prevents the peoples of most countries from achieving the industrial activity that would bring a higher standard of living.

We in the United States have been most fortunate. Our economy firmly based on our family-farm system of agriculture, has brought us the highest standard of living in the world. The farmers, themselves, have not benefited equitably in this standard. They are the ones caught in a vicious circle, for as the level of farm productivity has risen, their income has fallen.

In 1952, the Government had on hand about \$2.5 billion in farm produce, a reasonable level of commodities to meet emergencies and to bring stability to the market.

In the 8 Benson years, costs of supporting farm income soared, until by the end of 1960 the Government had a \$9 billion inventory of farm commodities on hand. Carrying charges alone on wheat and feed grains had mounted to \$900 million annually by 1961. And farm income had progressively declined.

This was not the fault of the farmer. It was the fault of the Benson programs forced upon the farmer. Statistics on production, consumption, and Government costs during the 1950's indicate that overall farm policies were faulty. Carryover stocks of feed grains at the beginning of the 1961 marketing year had reached an alltime high of nearly 85 million tons—more than four times those of 1952.

In 1961, under the emergency feed grain program, we made the first step in reducing the carryover to a more reasonable level. By the end of the 1961-62 marketing year, total carryover stocks are expected to be down by nearly 7.5 million tons. This is indeed an achievement. Members of this Congress who voted for the improved legislation can be proud of the success of the temporary feed grain program of 1961 and the prospects for continuing success in 1962.

But this success carries a high price tag because it does not include all producers. More than 25 million corn and grain sorghum acres were diverted to conserving uses by the 40 percent of the farms that chose to participate, at a cost of something more than \$780 million. At the same time, those producers who did not sign up for the program planted 6 to 7 million additional acres of corn and grain sorghum, thus offsetting 25 percent of the diversion made by the co-operators. These producers got a free ride—they produced additional grain which they sold on a market where the price was protected by the efforts of the voluntary compliers.

The willingness of producers to participate in the voluntary feed grain programs is a clear indication that they know full well that the existence of the surplus is the cause of price weakness. Those who did not sign up are aware of this, too, but they figured there was an advantage that could be taken under the program.

Under the feed grain program proposed in the amendment before us, feed

grain producers would be given the opportunity to choose a long-range program that would bring them good income at reduced Government costs, and without increasing the consumer prices for food.

Wheat producers repeatedly have endorsed supply management programs. The second Ellender amendment to the committee bill would enhance the prospects for a wheat certificate program, a concept which I have favored for many years.

A wheat certificate program, in place of the statutory national acreage allotment, would substitute authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to set a national quota, based on the requirements for wheat—domestic and export needs, including requirements for needy people at home and in friendly nations.

Despite the merits of both the wheat and feed grains proposal before the Senate the question has been raised whether farmers voting in a referendum will approve them. In the State of North Dakota quota referendums have been approved by margins greater than 90 percent for years. Certainly farmers will vote for the wheat marketing certificate program if given the opportunity. The feed grain and wheat programs are designed to complement each other—to go hand in hand. This becomes apparent when we look at the provision which would permit wheat to be planted on the feed grain allotments and feed grain to be planted on wheat allotments. This would give farmers a flexibility in planting which is much needed without increasing supplies of wheat or feed grains.

With these amendments, the Agriculture Act of 1962 would greatly strengthen the agricultural economy of our Nation; also, it provides the basis for sharply curtailed expenditures of the U.S. Treasury and reduces carryover. As I stated earlier, it provides the basis for increased farm income. The Agriculture Act of 1962, with the amendments cited, is worthy of the support of Members of the U.S. Senate, whatever geographical area they may represent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, I submit an amendment, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MERCALF], to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, S. 3225. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table; and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, between lines 25 and 26, insert the following:

"(6) by adding a new subsection at the end of section 16 of said Act to read as follows:

"(g) The Secretary of Agriculture shall not enter into an agreement in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota to provide financial or technical assistance for wetland drainage on a farm under authority of this Act, if the Secretary of the Interior has made a finding that wildlife preservation will be materially harmed on that farm by such drainage and such finding, identifying specifically the farm and the land on that farm with respect to which the finding was made, has been filed with the Secretary of Agriculture within ninety days after the filing of the application for drainage assistance: *Provided*, That the limitation against offering such financial and technical assistance shall terminate (1) one year after the date on which the adverse finding of the Secretary of the Interior was filed unless during that time an offer has been made by the Secretary of the Interior or a State government agency to lease or to purchase the wetland area from the owner thereof as a waterfowl resource, (2) five years in any event after the date on which such adverse finding was filed, and (3) immediately upon any change in ownership of the land with respect to which such adverse finding was filed. The provisions of this subsection shall become effective July 1, 1962."

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, the purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide a procedure for reconciling the disagreements which have arisen over the administration of two important and well-established Federal programs: that of financial and technical assistance for wetland drainage, carried out under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that of preservation of wildlife habitat, under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior.

The difficulties of administration are concentrated in the prairie pothole region of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and my amendment applies only to the wetlands in these three States.

There are, of course, a number of ways in which Minnesota and the neighboring Dakotas make a special contribution to the national welfare, but in this case it is the preservation of ducks and other migratory waterfowl. The duck hunters and the wildlife conservationists of the Nation are greatly indebted to the farmers and to the wildlife agencies of these three States for the preservation of waterfowl habitat, since the migratory waterfowl nesting areas in the United States are primarily in these States.

At the same time the farmers of these areas have a proper interest in making the most efficient use of their land and in cooperating with the agencies of the Department of Agriculture in the long-range conservation program. The problems arise in the borderline cases where experts may nonetheless disagree on whether the interest of the farmer and of conservation are better served by drainage of wetlands or by establishing them as refuges.

From the beginning the Soil Conservation Service has recognized the value of wildlife conservation.

Over the past 20 years the Soil Conservation Service has issued a number of regulations and entered into agree-

ments with Federal and State wildlife agencies in an attempt to resolve this problem. A summary of the wildlife and drainage policies of the Department of Agriculture, 1935-61, has been prepared by the Soil Conservation Service and I believe the report is evidence of the conscientious efforts to solve this problem and evidence, also, of the need for legislative action now.

The officials of both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior have reached agreement on the desirability of legislation. Bills were introduced in the last session and hearings were held by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and on September 13, 1961, the House approved a bill to deal with the problem (H.R. 8520).

In the statement of the Department of Agriculture before the House Committee, Gladwin E. Young, Deputy Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, stated:

We wish to make it clear that the Department of Agriculture recognizes wildlife as a valuable asset . . . national policy has given definition to public interest in both efficient farming and wildlife. A solution to conflict between these two major uses of land cannot be found, therefore, merely by giving one type of use complete priority over the other.

In a letter to Representative POAGE, chairman of the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House, Mr. D. H. Janzen, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior, stated:

We are no more anxious to withhold drainage assistance from farmers, where such drainage will not adversely affect wildlife, than is the Department of Agriculture. With review of projects as contemplated by this measure, and with judicious appraisal of the wetland values involved, we see no reason to anticipate that our Department would deny assistance in any case except where significant wildlife values exist. The Department of Agriculture has many times gone on record supporting this position and has done so in their statements on this bill.

Briefly, under the provisions of H.R. 8520, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot approve assistance to farmers for wetlands drainage if the Secretary of Interior finds that wildlife preservation would be harmed thereby. The Secretary of Interior must file his finding with the Secretary of Agriculture within 90 days of the application by a farmer for assistance, or else the prohibition will be lifted. The limitation may also be terminated within 1 year after the filing by the Department of Interior of an adverse finding unless the Secretary of Interior or a State government agency offers to lease or purchase the wetland as a waterfowl resource.

H.R. 8520 was referred to the Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry, of which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], is chairman and I am a member. Questions were raised about the procedure under the House bill. In particular, the objection was made that the bill left one situation inconclusive. If the Secretary of Interior makes an offer to lease or purchase, but the farmer finds the terms

unacceptable, there is no provision in the House bill for a final solution of the disagreement.

Several months ago I took up with Secretary Freeman certain questions and objections which had been raised. I believe that his reply reflects both the spirit of cooperation by the Department of Agriculture with wildlife preservation objectives and the need for some perfecting language in the House bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCARTHY. Madam President, the amendment which I shall offer to the farm bill retains the substance of the House bill, which is to give the Secretary of Interior the right to make a finding and to offer to purchase or lease the wetlands for a waterfowl habitat, but it provides that the limitation against the Secretary of Agriculture's offering financial and technical assistance shall terminate under any one of three conditions: First, 1 year after the date on which the adverse finding of the Secretary of the Interior was filed unless during that time an offer has been made by the Secretary or a State agency to lease or purchase the wetland; second, 5 years, in any event, after the date on which the adverse finding was filed; and third, immediately upon any change of ownership of the land involved.

The effect of my amendment is to provide an orderly procedure in cases where the governmental wildlife agency and the owner cannot reach agreement. It provides a negotiation period of up to 5 years, which I believe is a very generous time period. Under this provision both the farmer and the wildlife agency are given an incentive to reach agreement, but at the same time it prevents the possibility of an indefinite impasse by which farmers in these three States could be permanently denied an opportunity to secure the financial and technical assistance available to farmers in other States of the Nation.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that the amendment refers only to grants and expenditures under Government programs. It does not require any farmer to lease or sell his land or otherwise interfere with his use of it. He would be free at any time to drain at his own expense or to make any use of his land he chooses. The amendment is limited to questions involving the use of Government funds, either by the Department of Agriculture for financial or technical assistance or by the Department of Interior or a State wildlife agency to establish a wildlife habitat.

Proposed legislation to deal with this problem has received strong support from groups interested in the preservation of migratory waterfowl. The Department of Agriculture, after many years of attempting adjustments through administrative action, favors legislation. So does the Department of Interior. The House of Representatives has already approved a bill.

It is my opinion that the amendment which I have submitted, and which will

be called up at the appropriate time, resolves the major procedural question involved. I believe that the adoption of the amendment, which is an amended version of the House bill, will permanently solve the problem.

EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1962.

HON. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Your letter of February 12, 1962, relative to the engrossed bill, H.R. 8520, now before your Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has been given careful consideration. You have raised several pertinent questions that do need clarification for the benefit of those who will administer and participate in this proposal as it becomes law.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has vigorously promoted the proper use of land for several decades. We have recognized—and have been joined by millions of farmers in this—that wildlife habitat is an important resource of the private lands of the Nation. In the three-State area referred to in H.R. 8520 there has been a long-term and determined effort to evolve an equitable arrangement that recognizes the unique features of this "pothole area" for migratory waterfowl habitat. However, the highly competitive demands and potentials of the proper land use in this pothole area suggests that legislative policy would be desirable.

The following discussion will be an attempt to answer the questions you raised. You may want to request the Department of the Interior to comment on some of these questions. We have worked closely with their officials on this matter, and we assure you that we will continue to do this in the future.

The purpose of H.R. 8520 is to give statutory authority for a cooperative arrangement between the Agriculture and Interior Departments somewhat similar to but not identical with the agreement which is now in effect on a trial basis. The bill goes much further to define responsibilities. The agreement now leaves the final decision in the hands of the Department of Agriculture's county ASC committees. There is now no well-defined responsibility on the part of the Department of the Interior to offer the farmer a reasonable alternative if their finding is against drainage. We have no information as to the extent that farmers have been offered a lease or purchase agreement in such cases.

There are about a dozen counties in which the present cooperative arrangement is in effect. It will be desirable to have a uniform policy and procedure in the 89 pothole counties in the two Dakotas and Minnesota, and the Department of Agriculture offers no objection to the enactment of this measure especially if certain interpretations are agreed to as stated in our testimony on this bill to the House Agriculture Committee. You have raised two points that definitely need clarification prior to enactment of H.R. 8520:

1. As you point out, the bill might be interpreted that if the present owner finds the offer made by the Secretary of the Interior unacceptable, he will from that time on indefinitely be denied assistance on the land in question. While we had not considered this to be the case, it would certainly seem reasonable that H.R. 8520 should not be designed or interpreted to create situations that would remain unresolved indefinitely.

It would be reasonable to make this point clear in the legislative history or to change the bill to provide that a new owner of the land be given full opportunity to renew the total process, including that of applying for drainage assistance, if he so desired. It would also seem reasonable that provision

should be made to provide that if the present owner finds the offer unacceptable, that after a period of 5 years or so the owner would have a right to file an application with the county ASC committee for reconsideration of his request for Federal assistance for drainage of the specific area.

2. Your question calls attention that the bill does not give the Department of Agriculture authority to join with the Department of the Interior in determining what is a reasonable offer. Nor does it provide the owner with an opportunity to appeal to the Department of Agriculture if he thinks the offer to lease or buy is unreasonable. The legislative history made during the debate in the House dealt briefly with the term "reasonable offer." It would seem to us that as the Department of the Interior administers their program for land acquisition for protection of waterfowl habitat it will seek the cooperation of several agencies—Federal, State, and local in setting standards, but it would seem correct to leave the final administration with the Department of the Interior. Success of an accelerated program of land acquisition for this purpose will naturally depend primarily on favorable response from farmers and ranchers who now control this land. Landowners will probably be somewhat reluctant to participate unless the offers are reasonable.

We will help in any way we can to resolve these few unanswered questions, and appreciate your interest in this entire matter.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator for offering the amendment. I am interested in studying it further. I know it will be very interesting and helpful to the objectives of two Representatives from my State, Representative REUSS and Representative JOHNSON, who are most desirous to secure action on this proposal.

I think the attention of the Senate should be called to the taxpayer implications and the national responsibility implications of the amendment.

As I understand, one difficulty is that farmers now can receive Federal payments for draining wetlands on their property, while at the same time public moneys are expended for creating wetlands to enable the preservation of wildlife. Is not that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct; yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Often the land which is drained is ideal and helpful for the preservation of wildlife, has been used for this purpose for years, and provides great recreational value.

The Senator from Minnesota has said that the amendment would affect farms in his State and in the States of North Dakota and South Dakota. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. The bill in its present form is confined to three States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that indicates characteristic statesmanship on the part of the Senator from Minnesota. The amendment affects the farmers of his own State. I know some persons have objected to the proposal on the ground that farmers would be deprived of Federal payments or, at least, because Federal payments might be held up. The fact that the Senator from Minne-

sota himself offers an amendment and has distinguished cosponsors indicates that this is a matter of national concern.

As I understand, if the Secretary of the Interior finds that the payment by the Secretary of Agriculture to a particular farmer might result in the destruction of wetlands, then he would be able to make an adverse finding, and could then permit one of three courses to take place. Under the first finding, the payment could be held up for 1 year.

Mr. McCARTHY. For 1 year; that is correct.

Mr. PROXMIER. At most, for 5 years. Under no circumstances could it be for more than 5 years. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Secretary could hold up payment for 1 year simply by a finding and by putting a "hold" on the land. If within that 1 year no effort had been made by the Department of the Interior or by a State agency concerned with wildlife preservation, the farmer could renew his request for Government aid, and his application would again be given consideration.

The action then would depend entirely on the authorities of the Department of Agriculture. At that time they would have acknowledged the "hold" by the Department of the Interior and have given that Department a year to take action. If the Department of the Interior had not taken action, the Department of Agriculture could again consider the farmer's request for participation in the Department of Agriculture program.

However, if within that year an offer to lease or purchase were made by the Department of the Interior or by a State agency, the farmer could refuse it, but he could not turn to the Department of Agriculture again until approximately 5 years had elapsed.

I assume he could be released at any time by the Department of the Interior if that Department said its offer no longer stood. Then the farmer could go back again to the Department of Agriculture and say, "The Department of the Interior is no longer interested in this offer; therefore, I should like to have Department of Agriculture assistance."

Mr. PROXMIER. The Senator from Minnesota has submitted his proposal as an amendment to the pending bill and expects to call it up, does he?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. The amendment is an amendment to the House bill, which will be offered as an amendment to the pending bill. The problem with the House bill was that there was no provision by which a farmer could really at any point say, "I now want to go back to the Department of Agriculture for aid under the existing agricultural program." Once the Department of the Interior had said, "No," that was a kind of final, absolute "No."

The amendment attempts to establish a sort of statute of limitations which will run against the Department of the Interior and other wildlife agencies by providing that they will have to act within these limitations.

Mr. PROXMIER. Do I correctly understand that both the Department of

Agriculture and the Department of the Interior favor the proposal and have had an opportunity to consider the amendment in relation to the program?

Mr. McCARTHY. Both Departments have had an opportunity to consider the amendment. It is my understanding that there is no objection to it on the part of either Department.

The letter from Secretary Freeman to me does not give his absolute endorsement of it, but he states, in part:

1. As you point out, the bill might be interpreted that if the present owner finds the offer made by the Secretary of the Interior unacceptable, he will from that time on indefinitely be denied assistance on the land in question. While we had not considered this to be the case, it would certainly seem reasonable that H.R. 8520 should not be designed or interpreted to create situations that would remain unresolved indefinitely.

It would be reasonable to make this point clear in the legislative history or to change the bill to provide that a new owner of the land be given full opportunity to renew the total process, including that of applying for drainage assistance, if he so desired. It would also seem reasonable that provision should be made to provide that if the present owner finds the offer unacceptable, that after a period of 5 years or so the owner would have a right to file an application with the county ASC committee for reconsideration of his request for Federal assistance for drainage of the specific area.

The amendment I propose provides a 5-year limitation which, the Secretary indicates in his letter, would not seem to be unreasonable. He states:

It would also seem reasonable * * * that after a period of 5 years or so—

And so forth.

Mr. PROXMIER. So the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota seems to comply with the requirement therein set forth in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, does it?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I think this letter from the Secretary of Agriculture and the response by the Department of the Interior can fairly be interpreted as recommendations of this amendment or statements in support of such an amendment.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFUGEES FROM COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the distinguished deputy majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY] spoke about the situation of the refugees who have come from Com-

munist China into Hong Kong. At this time, I should like to discuss that subject.

Mr. President, the problem of refugees has interested me greatly ever since I have been a Member of Congress. I have sponsored many pieces of legislation in order to deal with it. Furthermore, in 1947, when I first came to Congress, I served on the first committee of the other body to investigate the problem of the refugees and escapees who then were in the displaced persons camps in Germany and Austria; and I had some hand in the legislation, subsequently enacted, to deal with that subject. So I have a very deep interest in the subject, and I qualify that interest in the ways I have just now stated.

Mr. President, I would agree, first, that our U.S. authorities should make available the food for possible allocation to the authorities of the Chinese Nationalist Government on Taiwan, in order to enable them to care for the greatest possible number of Chinese refugees coming from Communist China into Hong Kong; and I add my voice to those raised here earlier today in urging that that be done. Of course I shall cooperate fully, in every way open to me, toward that end.

Second, Mr. President, it is shocking that those who seek to escape from communism to freedom should be turned away; and it is almost too awful to contemplate that they should be transported back, behind the Communist border from which they have escaped. Yet that is exactly what has happened in Hong Kong.

Of course, Mr. President, we have had quite complete experience with such situations, in connection with the border between East Germany and West Germany and the situation existing between the East German Government and the Government of the German Federal Republic, until very recently.

Mr. President, I hail with satisfaction the fact that the Chinese Nationalist Government now appears to be agreeing to take a substantial number of these refugees from Communist China; and I speak with the greatest unhappiness in regard to any thought of returning them or transporting them back, as the British have thought they had to do, from Hong Kong.

But let us understand that the responsibility for this situation applies to the entire world, not only to the British in Hong Kong.

Mr. President, I have been in Hong Kong, and I realize only too well the absolutely impossible physical conditions under which Hong Kong labors, and also the fact that it is not beyond the possibilities that the Communist Chinese would open wide the floodgates, in order literally to inundate Hong Kong, in order to destroy it—a technique which is entirely within the inhumanity and brutality, in terms of the treatment of human beings, of which the Chinese Communist regime would be capable.

In addition, we know that that regime is having tremendously great problems because of famine and the shortage of food—which constitute all the more reason why that regime would be anxious, on political grounds, to unload as much

of the human problem as possible on Hong Kong.

So, Mr. President, much as we hail the action of the authorities on Taiwan in taking these refugees, and also much as we commend our own authorities for making surplus food available in order better to enable that to be done, at the same time we must point out that there is not only a breakdown of the processes of freedom in Hong Kong, but also a breakdown which faces the entire world; and we must demonstrate a willingness to resettle the refugees from Communist China—subject to all our procedures for screening; and so forth, with which we are familiar—just as we have demonstrated our willingness to do that for the refugees from behind the Iron Curtain in East Germany, because the whole world will expect all the nations of the world, including our own country, to make an equal approach to the problems of humanity herein involved, and also an equal approach to the winning of the cold war, which also is here involved, regardless of the color of the skins of the persons involved—whether they be white, as in the case of the refugees from East Germany, or whether they be yellow, as in the case of the refugees from Communist China.

So, Mr. President, in addition to the second point, which is the reception by the Nationalist Chinese of the Chinese refugees from Communist China and the help given by our country to those refugees, by means of making food available, the third point in connection with this situation is that it calls for a concert of the nations, perhaps through the auspices of the United Nations, so that—just as was done in the case of the displaced persons problem and other problems in connection with refugees of this character—all the countries of the world will bear their equal share of the responsibility, in accordance with their capability for bearing some of this burden.

In short, Mr. President, this problem is not confined to Taiwan and Hong Kong. Instead, it is a problem for all the world, because all of us are engaged in this struggle.

So the third point would be that the United States perhaps might well take the initiative in raising it as an international question, and, either by the extension of the work of the High Commissioner for Refugees of the United Nations, if that can be accomplished, or by an ad hoc meeting of the nations of the world which have the capability for absorption of some of these refugees, to seek to allocate the burden and responsibility on a fair-share-per-nation basis.

Fourth, we have an organization called the International Rescue Committee, which has already looked into this matter, and of which the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. PELL], if my memory serves me correctly, is a very important official. This organization has called it to the attention of the world. It is organized and able to utilize privately contributed funds for the purpose of helping to alleviate the very dreadful condition of these refugees.

So, Mr. President, I urge my fellow Americans to consider giving support to

the International Rescue Committee. I might tell the Chair that, as I am in the habit of practicing what I preach, I am sending a check to the International Rescue Committee, myself, today, in order to produce, in the fastest possible way—and that is the fastest possible way—additional resources for the care which we solicit here and in other places for these refugees from Communist China.

Finally, let us not ever overlook for a moment the tremendous significance of the kind of an exodus the flight of these refugees represents; and it is an exodus, apparently, of very significant moment from a Communist country, especially a Communist country which has been as bitter and intransigent in its hate-America campaign as has the regime of Communist China.

Just as we are inclined to look with considerable gratification on the fact that no country we know of, once free, has turned Communist, and that some of them, although they have veered in that direction, have retraced their steps very hurriedly—except for the dreadful example which we have in Cuba, right off our shores—so we have a right to take considerable satisfaction from the fact that we have had no exodus from the free world to the Communist world. Even those very few who have even thought of the idea have in many cases turned right around and retraced their steps. We had an instance of that only a few days ago.

Mr. President, this is an acid test for mankind. While we talk about spending billions and billions of dollars of our treasure for defense—which is right, and which we all support—and the tremendous sacrifices which our young people must undertake, such as the Marines are making now in the new and extremely dangerous area of the Thai-Laos border, we must also remember there are other places in which the Communist danger and the totalitarian threat to mankind can be broken.

One of them can be illustrated, as the refugees themselves are demonstrating, not only by the delusion, but by the downright tragedy and illness, in social terms, which exist in those Communist lands. Of course, the exodus from those lands is the most eloquent testimony on that score.

So, Mr. President, here is a four-point program which I strongly urge my colleagues to support and which I myself support: First, resettlement in Taiwan, in response to the offer which has already been made, and for which we should give all due credit to the Nationalist Chinese authorities, President Chiang Kai-shek and those who work with him. Second, the offering of food from our country, under our food-for-peace program. Third, some international action to allocate these refugees to those countries that are able to absorb numbers of them, on the traditional fair-share theory which we employed so effectively with other groups of displaced persons and refugees. Fourth, again the expression of the bountiful heart of our country in terms of private benefaction for which we are noted throughout the world, and of which I, for one, and many other

Americans, are very proud; in this case through the organization of the International Rescue Committee, which has already taken notice of the situation and called it to the attention of the world, and which has the machinery and the ability to utilize such resources as may be made available to it in a really effective way.

This idea is not original with me. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] spoke of it, as did the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; but I think it is desirable to have a number of us join in so desirable an objective, both from the standpoint of humanity and our free society and the free world, and from the standpoint of the iron rigor of the struggle in which we are engaged with the Communists.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my colleague for the very thoughtful remarks he has made and the program he has enunciated.

Earlier today I spoke on one phase of this subject, which is the international action to allocate these refugees, and I spoke specifically of the obligations of the United States.

I am sure my colleague remembers when we adopted here in the Senate the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] which would have permitted 50,000 such refugees to be absorbed in this country. No action was taken on the amendment in the other body, unfortunately.

We now have before us an immigration bill sponsored by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and I believe my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], myself, and other Senators, which would in truth make just a small dent in this problem. It is incumbent upon us not simply to shed tears about this problem because it is a tragic situation, but also to gear ourselves to doing something about it.

I hope very much the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on this legislation or other legislation which would touch on this unique Hong Kong problem, as well as the larger immigration issues.

The United States could take only a very minuscule percentage of the millions on millions who want to flee from communism to freedom, but if we did that, and did it promptly, it would be a sincere token of our feelings. It would also yield rich returns internationally, particularly among those of our non-Communist friends of Asian extraction.

Of course, the natural place for many of these refugees to go would be to join their countrymen in Formosa. I must commend, as did the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Government of Taiwan for offering to take, I believe, unlimited numbers of those who may be brought to their shores.

The Nationalist Government should recall the magnificent job which Israel has done in saying, "We will open our doors to the Jews of any nation, even though we now have plenty of other

problems with our own people." That policy has already yielded rich dividends to Israel in economic resources and skills. The long-range gains will be greater still. I hope the same thing would be true here. The suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for increased use of American surplus food through expansion of the food-for-peace program is an excellent one. I join with him in commending that project to the Government. This is a situation which has deeply touched the hearts of Americans.

The idea of locking innocent people behind a wall and not allowing them freedom is abhorrent to Americans.

I think some modest share on the part of the United States in the resettlement of the refugees would be well received by the American people. It is my hope that the remarks made today by a number of Senators will have the result, among other things, of expediting hearings on proposed legislation which many of us are sponsoring.

I thank my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I point out that my colleague who serves on the Committee on the Judiciary in the other body and my colleague who serves on the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate both serve on committees which can deal with the problem, as the Senator has properly said. I am grateful to my colleague also for highlighting the point, which, of course, gets confused in these discussions, that no one is asking for an inundation by these refugees into the United States. As my colleague says, a very modest number would set the tone for the rest of the world, where there may be more congenial surroundings and relationships for the great number of these people.

If we are not ready to take a fair share, an earnest of our good faith, it is very hard to ask others to do so. I am glad my colleague has made that point, because Americans should understand clearly that no one is asking the impossible within the context of our national life. All that is asked is a demonstration of our willingness to do our fair share, in a reasonable and decent way.

GIFT OF CYLDE B. AITCHISON PAPERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON LIBRARY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce the very valuable gift of the Clyde B. Aitchison's papers to the University of Oregon Library.

The papers of a great American, Clyde B. Aitchison, have been presented to the University of Oregon Library by his daughter, Beatrice Aitchison. It is my privilege to make this announcement on her behalf. As Senators know, Commissioner Aitchison, who died last January at almost 87, was a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for 35 years. He was appointed originally in 1917 by President Wilson and served until his retirement in 1952, when he went into private practice of law for the first time in almost half a century.

Before Mr. Aitchison went on the Commission, he had helped to draft the origi-

nal legislation and served brilliantly on the Oregon Railroad and Public Service Commissions, and during this period earned a master of arts degree from the University of Oregon.

After some years on the Interstate Commerce Commission he registered as a graduate student at the American University and in 1932 was awarded a doctor of philosophy degree in economics, on a thesis which traced the evolution of transportation regulation in Great Britain and showed how each step in that country foreshadowed action in this Nation. He taught a course in administrative law for several years at that university.

In response to Senate Resolution 334, 69th Congress, and Senate Resolution 17, 70th Congress, Commissioner Aitchison was requested by the Commission to compile the Federal laws relating to the regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, with annotations, tables and indexes. This he did in 5 monumental volumes, followed almost immediately by 3 more. By now, there are 18 volumes of "Annotations," published originally as a Senate document, invaluable to anyone concerned with the regulation of transportation.

As a former law professor of legislation with emphasis in the course placed upon constitutional law and administrative law, I consider Clyde B. Aitchison to be the outstanding scholar and authority in the field of interstate commerce regulation of this generation.

The selection of the University of Oregon Library as the depository of the papers and writings of Commissioner Aitchison is an invaluable contribution to the many future scholars in this field of administrative law who, in the years to come, will do their research among the papers in the Aitchison collection. Before his death, Commissioner Aitchison authorized his daughter, Dr. Beatrice Aitchison to select the University of Oregon. Prior to his death, the University of Oregon had asked for his papers and assured Commissioner Aitchison and his daughter, Dr. Beatrice Aitchison, that the collection would be maintained in accordance with the efficient library procedures essential to scholars who will do their research among the Aitchison papers.

The value of these papers simply cannot be measured in terms of dollars for the obvious reason that reference sources for almost unlimited research in any field of knowledge are priceless. However, measured in terms of library budgets for research materials, this is a very valuable collection of papers.

Clyde Aitchison made a deliberate choice of public service as a career and not as a stepping stone. He never regretted it, and we are glad of that. Men of his ability, energy and integrity give the Nation much more than they receive. Now his career goes on. Instead of being destroyed or packed away to gather dust, the records of 70 years of productive activity along many lines are made available to scholars, historians, those seeking light to throw on present and future problems—"The more things change, the more they are the same." A useful life

continues to be concretely helpful to those who follow.

The outstanding public service performed by Commissioner Aitchison during his many years on the Interstate Commerce Commission left an indelible print on Federal legislation. He was a witness many, many times over the years before the various committees of the Congress when interstate commerce legislation was under consideration. On the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, it came to be a commonplace question when interstate commerce legislation was before the committee, "What is the position of Commissioner Clyde Aitchison on the bill?"

His scholarly knowledge, seasoned by his abundance of good commonsense, made him the most influential witness who would be called before the Interstate Commerce Committee on any piece of interstate commerce legislation. There was a common saying, "If Aitchison is against it, look out; if he is for it, you have clear sailing." Of course, the Commissioner would be the first to deny that he exercised any such influence on legislation, because he was a modest man. Those of us who knew him and leaned upon him for expert advice on interstate commerce legislation can bear witness to the imprints of his brilliant mind on one piece of legislation after another.

As a Senator from Oregon, I am deeply moved and highly honored to be able to make the announcement today that the Aitchison papers are going to live on as a great reservoir for research study in the library of the State university of my State. In behalf of the University of Oregon, the government of the State of Oregon and the people of the State, I want to express to Dr. Beatrice Aitchison, daughter of Commissioner Clyde B. Aitchison, and to Bruce Aitchison, son of Commissioner Clyde Aitchison, my sincere thanks for the assistance and cooperation which they have extended to the University of Oregon in making available to the university this wonderful collection of their father's papers.

It is my hope that the Aitchison collection will be joined by other lifetime records, especially from those in the transportation field, and that far across this country which developed so rapidly because of transportation we will have a truly outstanding center of source material for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the university library's description of the papers be printed in the RECORD, as evidence of the depth and breadth of the collection.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVENTORY OF THE CLYDE BRUCE AITCHISON PAPERS

Clyde B. Aitchison (1875-1962) attorney and Interstate Commerce Commissioner, was born in Iowa, educated at Hastings College, the University of Oregon, and American University. He began the practice of law at Council Bluffs, Iowa, 1896, and removed to Portland, Ore., 1903. He was commissioner of the Railroad Commission of Oregon, and its successor, the Public Service Commission, 1907-16, and solicitor for the National Association of Railroad Commissioners, 1916-17.

From 1917 to 1952 he was Commissioner, Interstate Commerce Commission. After he retired he engaged in a private law practice.

The Clyde B. Aitchison Papers cover more than a century: 1853 to 1961. They arrange into eight natural parts.

Part 1: (Box 1-2) consists of various sets of correspondence and documents of the Aitchison family, beginning with Agnes Aitchison and John Young Aitchison, the grandmother and father, respectively, of Clyde Aitchison. In this part the most important series is the letters, documents, sermons, and copybooks of John Young Aitchison, Baptist clergyman, educated in Scotland, who had a wide reputation in the Middle West as a speaker, lecturer, and pastor. A second important series is the letters of William E. Aitchison, brother of Clyde Aitchison, whose letters from the University of Wisconsin (1880-84) are important to the history of education and to that university. The originals of this series are in the Wisconsin Historical Society, copies in this collection.

Part 2: (Box 3-5) begins the career of Clyde Aitchison, first as a student at Hastings College, Hastings, Nebr., as an attorney in Iowa and Oregon, and as Oregon railroad commissioner. Correspondence in this part includes a series between Clyde Aitchison and his mother, and with other members of the family. The most important letter series in this part consists of a long exchange (1915-29) between Clyde Aitchison and Joseph Teal, Portland attorney and public figure. This series refers to Portland politics and social affairs in a most intimate and informed way.

Part 3: (Box 7-14) commences with Aitchison's appointment as Interstate Commerce Commissioner in 1917. It includes all outgoing correspondence from 1919 to 1952. With the official correspondence are official memorandums and certain personal correspondence. This series of 89 volumes, labeled "Pink File" by Aitchison, is chronologically arranged, with a name index in each volume. There is in addition a series of miscellaneous loose letters, some official, some personal, both received and sent, 1915-52, arranged by correspondent.

Part 4: (Box 15-21) continues the file of Aitchison as Commissioner. This file group contains the various memorandums of the Commission. Box 15 includes only the conference and general memorandums. Boxes 16 to 21 contain legislative memorandums. These are the memorandums, accompanied by correspondence and documents, occasioned by congressional legislation affecting the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Each bill introduced in Congress was carefully examined for its effect on Commission activities, and "position papers" were prepared in support of or in opposition to proposed legislation. Included in this part is a long series of records relating to the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure (1939-49).

Part 5: (Box 22-30) continues the file of Aitchison as Commissioner. It consists of various Interstate Commerce Commission cases, with the correspondence and documents relative to each case. The file commences with railroad valuation cases, and follows with certain ex parte and docket numbered cases. In most instances the files include transcripts of testimony and similar working papers.

Part 6: (Box 31-33) concludes the file of Aitchison as Commissioner. It consists of the records of special projects undertaken by Aitchison. The first project deals with Federal control of railroads, particularly in wartime. The second involves a longtime study of British railroad experience, particularly in the matter of legislation and regulation.

Part 7: (Box 35-39) relates to Aitchison's career as a private attorney after retirement from the Interstate Commerce Commission

in 1952. It consists of his case files. The files include his services for the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, for the National Traffic Committee, and for the National Motor Freight Traffic Association, among others. Many of these cases were before the ICC.

Part 8: (Box 40-43) consists of personal miscellany between 1952 and 1961, including a chronological file of all personal and business correspondence, Aitchison's diaries and memo books (1913-60) and a collection of his public addresses and publication.

INVENTORY OF THE PAPERS OF CLYDE BRUCE AITCHISON

Box 1: Aitchison family genealogy and biography. Aitchison family photographs. Agnes Aitchison, letters received and sent, 1859-79. John Young Aitchison, letters received and sent, 1853-1905. John Young Aitchison, legal and personal documents. John Young Aitchison, sermons, addresses, copybooks.

Box 2: John Young Aitchison, copybooks. John Young Aitchison, letters concerning the death of John Young Aitchison, 1906. William Aitchison, Jr., letters sent, 1865-1908. Aitchison family, miscellaneous correspondence, 1873-1907. William E. Aitchison, letters received and sent, 1880-84, while a student at University of Wisconsin. (Typed copies only. Originals in Wisconsin Historical Society.) William E. Aitchison, letters sent, 1885-89.

Box 3: Clyde Aitchison. School mementos: Hastings High School. Hastings College. Legal documents and records as attorney before Iowa Supreme Court, 1898. Records and documents relative to Idlewild addition to Hood River, Oreg., 1907-47. Letters received from Mrs. John Y. Aitchison, 1906-24. Letters sent, including those of Bertha Aitchison, to Mrs. John Y. Aitchison, 1906-18. Letters received from members of Aitchison family, 1917-21.

Box 4: Clyde Aitchison: Letters received from members of Aitchison family, 1921-24. Letters and documents relative to election as Oregon railroad commissioner, 1908-13. Letters concerning reelection as Oregon railroad commissioner, 1913. Documents prepared as Oregon railroad commissioner, three briefs and one manual. Manual and documents as solicitor, valuation committee, National Association of Railway Commissioners, 1915-16. (See also valuation case documents, box 22.)

Box 5: Clyde Aitchison: Correspondence with Joseph Teal, 1915-29. Correspondence concerning appointment as Commissioner, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1916-17.

Box 6: Clyde Aitchison: Correspondence concerning reappointment as Commissioner, Interstate Commerce Commission, 1921, 1928, 1935, 1942, 1949.

Box 7: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, outgoing correspondence, March 17, 1919, September 30, 1921, 10 volumes in 7. "Pink file," volume "O" consists of memorandums preceding the "Pink file," volumes self-indexed.

Box 8: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, outgoing correspondence, October 5, 1921-July 6, 1930, 15 volumes in 6. "Pink file," volumes self-indexed.

Box 9: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, outgoing correspondence, July 7, 1930-38, 24 volumes in 7. "Pink file," volumes self-indexed.

Box 10: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, outgoing correspondence, 1939-42, 18 volumes in 7. "Pink file," 1942 volume in 2 parts: Part 1, memorandums; part 2, correspondence, volumes self-indexed.

Box 11: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, outgoing correspondence, and memorandums, 1943-46. Miscellaneous memorandums, 1947, 10 volumes in 8. "Pink file," volumes self-indexed.

Box 12: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, outgoing correspondence, and memorandums, 1947-52, 8 volumes. "Pink file," volumes self-indexed.

Box 13: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, outgoing correspondence, 1951-52, one volume. Personal correspondence, 1945-52, three volumes. Miscellaneous correspondence, 1932-52, A-R, including major files, 1915-32; Marshall Dana, Winthrop M. Daniels, Carl V. Elmquist, Richard T. Ely, Herschel A. Hollopeter, T. W. Jacobs, Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., Lewis A. McArthur, William C. McCulloch, Wayne L. Morse, Felix J. C. Pole, Mark W. Potter, Clyde M. Reed, Robert P. Reeder.

Box 14: Clyde Aitchison: ICC Commissioner Aitchison, miscellaneous correspondence, 1932-52, S-Z, including major files, 1915-52: I. L. Sharfman—C. E. R. Sherrington—Max Thelen—Luther Walter—Daniel Willard. Memorandums, Chief Counsel, ICC, 1917-25, three volumes, indexed.

Box 15: Clyde Aitchison: ICC memorandums, conference and general memorandums, 1920-44. ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, 63d Congress (1914), 78th Congress (1938), including Eastman plan.

Box 16: Clyde Aitchison: ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, 78th Congress (1938), House bills, 80th Congress (1947-48), House bills.

Box 17: Clyde Aitchison: ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, 80th Congress (1947-48), House bills, 81st Congress (1949-50), general memorandums, Senate.

Box 18: Clyde Aitchison: ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, 81st Congress (1949-50), Senate bills, 82d Congress (1951-52). ICC memorandums, concerning freight forwarder bills, 1939-41.

Box 19: Clyde Aitchison: ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, concerning freight forwarder bills, 1941-51. ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, concerning Phillips bill, to provide for review of orders of the ICC. Includes correspondence and working papers.

Box 20: Clyde Aitchison: ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, concerning Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure. Includes reports, bills, hearings, and statements, 76th to 79th Congresses, 1939-45.

Box 21: Clyde Aitchison: ICC memorandums, legislative memorandums, concerning Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure. Includes correspondence, working papers, reports, and publications, 1939-49.

Box 22: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents, valuation cases. Federal valuation of the railroads in the United States, Philadelphia, 1915, one volume. Association of American Railroads, valuation committee, report, 1916, one volume. National Association of Railway Commissioners, valuation committee, bulletins, and documents, 1916-17, one volume. ICC cases on procedure, evidence, and valuation of railroads, two volumes. ICC valuation case memorandum with respect to valuation, one volume. ICC digest of decisions in valuation cases, 1932, one volume. ICC report of recapture board, three volumes, includes index.

Box 23: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. ICC valuation docket 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: (1) Atlanta, Birmingham & Atlantic Railroad; Georgia terminal; Atlanta Terminal Railroad; (2) Texas Midland Railroad; (3) New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railroad Co.; (4) Kansas City Southern Railway Co.; (5) Winston-Salem Southbound Railway Co. (briefs, hearings, 1917-20, nine volumes). ICC bibliography on valuation, one volume.

Box 24: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. Ex parte No. 57, "15-percent rate case," documents and testimony, 1917. Ex parte 71, In re section 422 of the Federal Transportation Act, hearings, 1920,

one volume. Docket No. 13293, general rate investigation before ICC briefs, two volumes; summary of testimony and arguments, one volume, 1921-22. Docket No. 15100, depreciation charges of steam railroad companies, hearings, 1923, one volume.

Box 25: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. Ex parte 87, Docket No. 17000, rate structure investigation. Revenues in western district, summary of testimony, 1925, four volumes. Ex parte 115. Increases in freight rates, fares, and charges. Before the ICC abstracts of testimony, arguments, correspondence, and forms, four volumes, 1934-37.

Box 26: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. Ex parte 115 (continued and concluded), six volumes.

Box 27: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. Ex parte 123 and 125, increases in rates, fare, and charges. Before the ICC, 15-percent case. Correspondence, abstract of testimony, abstract of argument, 6 volumes, 1937-38.

Box 28: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. Docket 2600, general rate level investigation before the ICC. Summary of testimony and argument, 1 volume, 1933. Ex parte 126, express rates, letters, and telegrams, 1 volume, 1938. Dockets 28300, 28310, MC-C-150. Class rate investigation, 1939. Consolidated freight classification, 1939. Motor freight classification, 1939. (Correspondence, documents, 2 volumes). Ex parte 148, 162, 166. Increased railway rates, fares, and charges, 1942, 1946. Letters and telegrams, 2 volumes. Dockets 29663, 29664, 29708. In the matter of transcontinental rail rates (29663). Intercoastal water rates (29664). All-water, water-rail, and rail-water rates between Pacific coast ports and interior points (29708), 1947. Transcript of testimony, volumes 1-8.

Box 29: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. Docket 29663, 29664, 29708 (continued and concluded), volumes 9-77. Dockets 29721, 29722, 13457. In the matter of all-rail commodity rates between California, Oregon, and Washington (29721). Pacific coastwise water rates (29722). Pacific coast fourth section applications (13457). Hearings, transcripts of testimony, 1949, 14 volumes.

Box 30: Clyde Aitchison: ICC cases and allied documents. Dockets 29663, 29664, and concluded, 1949-51. Dockets 30416 and 30660. In the matter of class rates, Mountain-Pacific territory, and transcontinental rail rates. Correspondence, exhibits, testimony, 1951. Federal control of railroads, World War I, studies, documents, correspondence.

Box 31: Clyde Aitchison: Federal control of railroads. Freight rate controversy, 1923, correspondence, memorandums. Coal crisis of 1923, correspondence, memorandums. War Policies Commission, 1931, reports, correspondence. Federal Coordinator of Transportation (Eastman) speeches, memorandums. Federal Coordinator of Transportation. Foreign Experience with Transportation Control (official study, mimeographed). World War II (including Office of Price Administration), 1946-50. Correspondence, memorandums.

Box 32: Clyde Aitchison: Special projects of Commissioner Aitchison: (1) Study of railway rate regulation in Great Britain; (2) study of the regulation of transportation in Great Britain, 1914-34. Notes, correspondence, source material, memorandums, 1932-52. (See also C.E.R. Sherrington correspondence, box 14.)

Box 33: Clyde Aitchison: Special projects of Commissioner Aitchison: (1) Federal Bar Association, Committee on Administrative Law, correspondence, memorandums, reports, on reform of administrative procedure, 1938-39 (see also Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, box 20, 21); (2) Brazil trip, 1944-45, correspondence,

literature, and report to Director, Office of Inter-American Affairs; (3) judicial conference, Advisory Committee on Administrative Procedure, correspondence, memorandums, reports, 1950-51 (see also Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, box 20, 21); (4) postwar planning report to the President, by Aitchison and Porter, report and working papers, 1943; (5) course outline and notes for course in administrative law, American University, Washington, D.C.

Box 34: Clyde Aitchison: Case files, Board of Transportation Commissioners for Canada, correspondence, judgments, orders, memorandums, 1953-61.

Box 35: Clyde Aitchison: Case files, ICC docket MC-C-1762, *Seattle Traffic Association v. Consolidated Freightways, Inc.* (on behalf of deferment), briefs, correspondence, exhibits, and documents, 1954-60.

Box 36: Clyde Aitchison: Case files, ICC docket MC-C-1762 (continued and concluded).

Box 37: Clyde Aitchison: Case files: (1) ICC docket 31660, Arkansas intrastate freight rates and charges (on behalf Reynolds Metal Co.), correspondence, briefs, documents, 1955-56; (2) ICC I and S docket 7151, guaranteed rates, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, to Chicago (agreed charges) (on behalf National Motor Freight Traffic Association), correspondence, briefs, memorandums; (3) ICC docket 32290, increased less-than-carload rates in official territory (on behalf National Motor Freight Traffic Association), 1958-59.

Box 38: Clyde Aitchison: Case files: (1) ICC docket 6062, petroleum in north Pacific coast territory (on behalf Pacific Inland Tariff Bureau, Inc.), correspondence, documents, 1952-54; (2) ICC MC-C-1796, *Portland Freight Traffic Association v. M. & M. Fast Freight* (on behalf the association), 1956; (3) ICC Ex parte 212, increased freight rates (on behalf North Pacific Lumber Co.), 1958; (4) ICC I and S docket 7250, contract rates—rugs and carpeting (on behalf National Motor Freight Traffic Association), 1959-60; (5) *Grace Line, Inc., et al. v. Panama Canal* (in consultation with and for C. Dickerman Williams), 1957-58; (6) CAB FFI docket 5947, indirect carriage of property (on behalf American Airlines), 1953-56; (7) Middle Atlantic Conference, correspondence, memorandums, documents, 1952-54; (8) Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference, correspondence, memorandums, documents, 1952-61; (9) American Trucking Association, memorandums, statements, documents concerning H.R. 6161 and other omnibus transportation bills, 1955-56.

Box 39: Clyde Aitchison: Case files: (1) National Traffic Committee, bulletins, reports, correspondence, memorandums, 1953-58 (includes file on "piggyback" transportation); (2) National Motor Freight Traffic Association, minutes, bulletins, reports, correspondence, memorandums, 1955-60 (see also specific cases on behalf the association).

Box 40: Clyde Aitchison: Personal and business correspondence, outgoing, 1952-61 (chronologically arranged, third copies). Personal miscellany; Hasting College correspondence, 1930-60; interstate male chorus and other music groups, correspondence, programs.

Box 41: Clyde Aitchison: Diaries, account books, memo books, 1913-60.

Box 42: Clyde Aitchison: Diaries, account books, memo books, 1913-60. Addresses and publications.

Box 43: Clyde Aitchison: Addresses and publications.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. NEUBERGER obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to me without losing her right to the floor.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the matter before the Congress is, of course, the agriculture bill. The bill was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. However, we find on our desks, having arrived today, 72 pages of amendments to that bill. They are extremely far-reaching amendments.

The wheat amendment, if approved, conceivably could raise considerable hob with the feed grain growers of this country, yet I do not believe that the feed grain growers even know the amendment is proposed.

There is a proposed dairy amendment, which would provide what the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rejected, that the Secretary of Agriculture might take quotas from one part of the country and transfer them to another. Apparently the talented gentleman from Texas who has been so successful in manipulating cotton allotments has inspired others to feel that efforts successful in respect to cotton might be even more successful in respect to the dairy business. But the dairy people do not know about the amendment.

Most of the Members of the Senate have not seen the amendments. It is true that they were printed at 10 o'clock this morning and made available, but most Senators have not seen them yet.

I understand that the White House and the Department of Agriculture are undertaking to do a "snow job" on the Congress, to have the amendments acted upon before the people back home, who may be made or broken by the adoption of the amendments, become aware of what is being proposed to affect their fortunes. So I sincerely hope that there will be no effort to force a vote on the amendments, which many Senators have not yet seen. I have only barely seen them. I have not had an opportunity to study them. I ask that the vote be delayed until ample time has been given to those who will be most seriously affected to know what is contained in them.

I think the point is extremely important. We are also occupied in the study of other questions, which were scheduled for consideration previous to the proposal of the amendments. The amendments were submitted late yesterday and not made available until earlier today.

The Committee on Foreign Relations is trying to mark up the foreign aid bill. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is usually a spokesman for the feed grain people, is involved in consideration of the foreign aid bill. He cannot be present in the Chamber. I am sure that he is intensely concerned with the pending business, which is a wheat proposal. I would not consider it in the least fair to undertake to press any of the amendments to a vote until Senators who would be affected by them have full opportunity to read and submit them to the people at home for analyses and to have the benefit of their judgment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to associate myself with those portions of the remarks of the Senator from Vermont which indicate that we need a little time to discuss the proposed amendments to the measure before the Senate. The amendments are sweeping in nature and far reaching in consequences.

Earlier today I talked with a representative of the Cattlemen's Association from the State of Texas, who was greatly concerned about the report that an amendment will be offered to reinstate the compulsory feed grain section. According to that visitor, that would be highly detrimental to the livestock industry. I happen to know that that is a position shared by the livestock industry of my own State. The man with whom I talked said it was highly important that a little time be given so that the livestock industry of the country generally might recognize the far-reaching consequences of a compulsory feed grain program, which would consequently result in a production control program, if not a price control program, for livestock.

So I hope that we may consider this subject in an orderly and deliberate fashion. I should like to recommend to the committee chairman and to the acting majority leader that some kind of unanimous-consent proposal be presented which would be agreeable to Senators generally, so that we could be assured that there would be no precipitate vote on any of the amendments, and so that the country could be assured that all the facts would be available before the Senate votes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that no attempts will be made for precipitate action. When the Senator from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, presented his amendments today, I alerted Senators on the Republican side of the aisle and suggested that they bring Senators to the Chamber. There is no more important business of the Congress than the agriculture bill that is now before the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is difficult to get Senators to come to the Senate Chamber.

I spent an hour and a half this morning trying to get Senators to come to the Chamber.

I would be the last one to want to force precipitate action on any proposals as important as the amendments which are before the Senate. I think the Senator knows that. The majority leader wishes to consult with Members on the minority side of the aisle as well as those on this side of the aisle with regard to some kind of unanimous-consent agreement. I think that would be helpful. I know the Senator from South Dakota has other responsibilities. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and I have other responsibilities.

Mr. MUNDT. Most Senators have.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We would like to regularize the procedure. I shall cooperate toward that end.

Mr. MUNDT. I was sure that the Senator would make that statement, and I am sure that the chairman of the committee would not say otherwise. The pressure would be removed if we could know in advance of the time that we were reaching the voting stage.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator from Minnesota stated, debate on the bill was started yesterday. It is difficult to bring Senators to the Chamber to listen. So far as I am concerned, the two amendments that I have proposed reveal nothing new. The subject was discussed in the committee. Hearings were held on the proposals for several weeks. I am satisfied that the cattle industry, as well as all others interested in the proposed legislation, know full well all about the amendments which I, in my own right as chairman of the committee, have offered.

The Senator from South Dakota knows very well that in respect to his proposal to have an alternate plan in the wheat provision of the bill, I stated that when the time came—perhaps not at the time, but soon thereafter—I would move to strike that option from the bill. That is what I am attempting to do now. That is the pending question. Insofar as the so-called feed grain proposal is concerned, there is nothing new in it. It is worded along the lines discussed when the bill was before the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is quite correct. He announced publicly that he would offer the two amendments. The livestock industry is primarily interested in a compulsory feed-grain proposal. A great many wheat farmers are vitally affected and interested in the proposal now before the Senate. As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, if the proceedings could be regularized so that all Senators would know when voting would begin, and that voting would not start at least until Senators who are absent attending to other duties have an opportunity to read the debates in the Record, I think we could move to dispatch the business of the day.

It is very difficult to keep Senators in the Chamber during general debate.

When the stage is reached when a vote is imminent, and the intention as to the time for voting is announced in the Record, interested Senators will make an endeavor to be present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. We can consider the amendments one at a time. We know that two key amendments will be voted upon. As the Senator from Vermont has said, there are some additional amendments, but the two key amendments are the wheat amendment, which was presented by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the feed grains amendment. Those are the two most controversial amendments. It seems to me that we might arrive at some kind of unanimous consent agreement which would give Senators who are vitally interested in the question time for study, and the advance notice required for orderly debate. I know that the majority leader is keenly interested in the proper procedure. He is interested in proceeding with the debate so that we may have a schedule next week, in which Memorial Day occurs, that would be helpful to our colleagues in the Senate. If Senators will give me some suggestions, I shall be happy to convey them to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is a reasonable man.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I had hoped that action on the bill could be concluded this week. However, up to this time most Senators do not know what discussion has taken place in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am afraid they do not know what the amendments provide. I am sure that they will want to consult with the people back home who are most affected in the various lines of agriculture. I suggest that we receive assurance that there will be no precipitate vote due to lack of speakers. Some Senators have not spoken because they do not yet know on what subject they should speak. They must read the amendments to find out what to speak on. Perhaps tomorrow we could consider the question of the time to start voting. Personally, I would hope it could be Thursday. Of course, I am in no position to speak for anyone else. I would hope it could be Thursday, and that we could conclude by Friday night.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the thinking of the majority leader, that possibly we could come to a vote by Thursday. With respect to the two amendments, the wheat amendment and the feed grains amendment, I do not believe there is any lack of understanding as to what those amendments mean. There are other amendments that are different, of course. I am sure that Senators will want to have some discussion of those amendments. I understand that there are dairy amendments and other amendments to be offered. Much

will be said about those amendments, and I can assure the Senator from Vermont that we will have all the time in the world to discuss those amendments. As to the wheat amendment and the feed grains amendment, I believe that after some reasonable hours of debate we ought to be prepared to come to a vote on those amendments. I will talk it over with the majority leader. Perhaps we can agree to vote early Thursday on those amendments, and possibly first discuss them with the Senators involved.

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking as one who has an amendment before the Senate now on a vital part of the wheat program, I am prepared to agree to let us start to vote on Thursday, with a reasonable amount of time allowed to discuss both sides of the amendment. I would assume that probably it would not require too lengthy a discussion once we can get the Senators here, because the issues with respect to it are not complicated. They are quite generally understood. All Members would probably be prepared to vote sometime after the morning hour on Thursday, after we had had an hour's debate, or so, on each side, and to such a proposal I would have no objection. It would be much better to do that than to have everyone agitated and worried about a vote coming sometime before he had a chance to confer with the various commodity groups and his constituents.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure every Senator that it was not my purpose to rush to a vote. I want to give Senators every opportunity in the world to discuss the amendments. I have tried to do that in the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. The chairman has always been fair. However, if we run out of speakers, and an amendment is before the Senate, there must be a vote, in spite of the patience of the chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont, as well as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, will cooperate with us to the end that we may be able to get to an end of the debate sometime this week.

Mr. MUNDT. I would like to see this result.

Mr. AIKEN. I am in favor of getting through with the discussion of the bill this week, if it is humanly possible. However, I believe that Members of the Senate ought to be reasonably well alerted as to when there would be a vote. When we run out of speakers, as we have almost run out of speakers today, a vote is in order, unless someone is in the position to block action. No one wants to do that. It is better to have a time set for voting.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We may be able to consummate an agreement as to time. Merely as a preliminary discussion at this time, could we possibly begin thinking about agreeing to vote on the wheat amendment, let us say, at 2:30 on Thursday, and that 2 hours later, after the wheat amendment is disposed of, vote on the feed grain amendment, using the time in between now and that time for general discussion of these matters?

Mr. AIKEN. Just as a general discussion now with reference to such an agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to toss this out, because I know the majority leader has said that he wants very much to come to this kind of agreement, because it is a more orderly procedure to follow.

Mr. MUNDT. I may say that such an arrangement would be within the realm of reasonableness so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Such an agreement would not cover the other amendments, such as the one in which the Senator from Vermont is very keenly interested. We would have to discuss this matter separately.

Mr. MUNDT. They should be incorporated in one unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. We should achieve an orderly method, such as the one suggested by the Senator from Minnesota. Of course, I am in no position to agree at this time. In fact, I have no authority to agree, anyway. The people who are concerned should have an opportunity to prepare their arguments if they have any, and alert their people at home. That would mean at least 24 hours in which to make known the contents of these amendments to the people who are most concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. After that, possibly before tomorrow night, we might take up the question with the majority leader and the minority leader as to when we might start to vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My only purpose in making the suggestion is to get some thinking about it tomorrow, after our colleagues have read the Record. The sooner we can come to an agreement, the more we could guide the debate so that there would be an equitable sharing of the time.

Mr. AIKEN. I was a little bit upset at the number of calls that have been made and the persons I have seen around on the Hill. I do not want anyone to think that it was all settled and that we might as well vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right. When one steps out into the hall he gets buffeted both ways.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to make the point that if the Senator from Minnesota could fix the time for voting at either 2 or 3 o'clock, it would suit me much better. The hour of 2:30 happens to be very bad for me. I make that as a personal request.

Mr. MUNDT. I would suggest that the Senator from Minnesota confer with the majority leader and consider coming before the Senate after a quorum call later this afternoon, to see if we can finalize the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that statement very much.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont commented that we had run out of speakers. It did not seem that way to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. AIKEN. I might say that I had prepared my extemporaneous remarks before I knew that the Senator from Oregon was going to speak.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. All joking aside, I have enjoyed the exchange which I have been privileged to hear, because the Senator from Oregon had a different reason, perhaps, from that expressed by the Senators who have spoken, for hoping that we would not come to a precipitate vote on the farm program.

Mr. President, it is the custom of the Senate to listen to the report of the committee which has deliberated upon the bill for as long as our committee has deliberated on the pending bill, and which has listened to the testimony, both pro and con, from all the organizations and groups involved, and to accept the report of the committee.

I am glad that we will have time to discuss the bill on the floor, because I believe that particularly those Senators who represent large urban areas should not take the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at face value, but should consider some other aspects of the bill.

Therefore I believe we have come to an agreement that we will proceed in an orderly fashion. There never was any intention to do a snow job or to have a precipitate vote on the bill. I wish to comment particularly on a few facts with respect to the cost of the program.

If we exclude the costs of war from the national budget—the costs of past wars and the expense of preventing future wars—the largest remaining budgetary item is agriculture. Next year, our agricultural programs will consume \$5,836 million—\$4,585 million for price supports alone.

During each congressional campaign there comes a moment when the candidate speaks out on the farm problem. To the accompaniment of rousing cheers, he delivers one of several traditional farm slogans—slogans with a full sound but a hollow meaning: "Let's Get the Government Out of the Farm Business," or "I Want To Help the Little Farmer."

And as the mouthing of slogans continues, the price of our farm program mounts ominously and omnivorously.

President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman have proposed rational permanent farm legislation—legislation as fair to the consumer and the taxpayer as to the farmer. The administration offered the farmer supports adequate to maintain farm income at past levels, and asked only that the farmer accept the conditions dictated by realism.

The administration offered the farmer a choice: "Tell the Government to get out of the farm business and we will get out—but if you want supports, accept the necessary controls."

Yet the very critics who vigorously call for the elimination of Government intervention in the farm market fought just as vigorously in committee to retain

existing programs. As a result, the committee bill has been stripped of adequate controls.

Voluntary programs can no more serve to reduce our farm surpluses than traffic lights without policemen could serve to generate traffic safety.

Voluntary programs tend to accentuate the upward trend in yields. Not only would cooperators attempt to make higher yields per acre; so would noncooperators as the price situation improved. With ability to stay out of the program 1 year and participate the next, producers can obtain the benefits of regular crop rotation—with pay.

Inability to require cross-compliance as a condition for price-support eligibility under a voluntary program places a definite handicap on the successful administration of other commodity programs. This is particularly true as between wheat and feed grains, but also applies to other allotment crops.

In addition to the hazards of emergency program continuation, the bill as reported by the committee has others—one of them connected with wheat. As now written, the bill would give farmers a choice in the wheat referendum, a choice they cannot fully understand.

Two choices would be offered to producers. One would be the program long in effect, as modified for the 1962 crop. It involves a reduced acreage allotment and voluntary land retirement. The other would be the wheat certificate program proposed by the President this year—a program similar in many respects to those advocated for years by the National Association of Wheat Growers, National Grange, and National Farmers Union.

If a majority of farmers chose the certificate plan, it would become a permanent wheat program. If a majority favored the 1962 program, it would be in effect for the 1963 crop.

But these are not the only choices farmers would have to make next summer. They would also vote on establishment of marketing quotas—the usual choice in wheat referendums. A two-thirds vote would be required to put marketing quotas into effect under either of the two programs. The trouble is, when a farmer is asked whether or not he favors marketing quotas for the 1963 crop, he does not know whether he is voting for marketing quotas under the certificate plan or under the emergency program. This is an impossible choice on short notice.

Congress should—Congress must—decide now on the permanent wheat program. We must consider not only the interests of producers, but the interests of the taxpaying public, as well. The emergency wheat program in effect this year is costly and cumbersome. Diversion payments to farmers for reducing plantings under the 1962 program will run between \$325 and \$350 million. Diversion payments under the proposed certificate plan would fall somewhere between \$200 and \$250 million. Further, the certificate plan will provide wheat growers with flexibility they have seldom had in planning farm operations

of recent years. It would permit them to grow wheat on their feed grain acreage allotments. This cannot be done under the present program and could not be done in 1963 under an extension of the 1962 emergency program.

Like the certificate program for wheat, the acceptance of a mandatory program for feed grains will result in substantially smaller budgetary expenditures than a voluntary program, and still accomplish desired results. This is due to two of the advantages of the mandatory over the voluntary program: First, the amount of payments for land diversion will not be as large; second, it would not be possible for increases in planted acreage by nonparticipants to offset any of the reductions made by participants. This applies to dairy as well as to feed grains. I believe that farmers should be made to choose between controls and price supports and nothing.

Payments for diversion of acreage under the program provided by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 are estimated for the marketing year for the 1963 crop to be possibly less than half of those required for the 1962 marketing year under the emergency, voluntary program. Depending on the support prices established, and the extent to which use is made of the grazing privilege in return for no diversion payment, estimated payments under a mandatory 1963 program will amount to between \$400 and \$500 million. This contrasts with payments in the neighborhood of more than \$800 million under the 1962 emergency program.

The absence, under a mandatory program, of feed grains produced on expanded acreages by noncooperators would decrease the quantity placed under loan and acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation below that which would occur under a voluntary program. This cut in CCC acquisitions would result in a large reduction in the net acquisition cost for 1963-crop feed grains from the 1962-crop figure.

Other items of current expenditure would be approximately the same under either a mandatory or voluntary program. However, there would be a slightly greater decrease in carrying charges under a mandatory than a voluntary program due to smaller amounts placed under loan or acquired.

Thus, a mandatory feed grains program would result in substantially less impact on the budget while at the same time accomplishing at least as great a reduction in carryover stocks with the resultant large savings in carrying charges over a long period of years ahead.

Mr. President, in the general welfare, I remind the Senate of the President's request for a comprehensive, long-range program to replace the present patchwork of short-run emergency measures.

Mr. President, I wish to comment especially on the fate of the dairy program, because in the committee I was one who voted to retain the \$3.40 a hundredweight support price, even though I knew our storage supplies were being built up. I did so because I felt that a

cutback to \$3.11 would only reduce the income of the farmer and would not result in any benefit to the consumer, who would see no change in the price of a quart of milk, and thereby would benefit only the middleman.

However, I believe the report of the Department of Agriculture with respect to the storage of dairy supplies should give us all pause for thought. Storage space for butter is an urgent problem. The Department of Agriculture says it now has 310 million pounds of butter in storage and expects to have more than 500 million pounds in storage by the end of the present dairy year, next March 31. The Department of Agriculture is now having to ship butter out of producing areas in order to find refrigerated storage. This means backhauling for packaging before the butter can be distributed on school lunch and relief programs, thus entailing more Government expense.

The Department of Agriculture is making an analysis of storage space for the long pull. If the dairy program continues as now, the question will arise as to whether the Government will have to pay for building more refrigerated storage. This lends urgency to the dairy situation. Failing this year, the administration will push for showdown action on dairy price supports next year. I say let us save the expense of storing several million pounds of butter and milk by adopting an amendment to the farm bill.

The Department of Agriculture is moving all the surplus butter it can. It is interesting to learn that people on relief are getting more butter than are the cash customers. A person on relief is getting about 12 pounds of butter as compared with 6 pounds for a person who buys for cash.

Mr. President, the time has come to adopt a realistic Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. Let us accept the responsibility for a meaningful choice and give farmers the opportunity to chart a course of action which will enable them and consumers alike to live equitably with abundance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the text of a resolution I have received from a number of farm organizations, expressing their opinion of the proposed Agriculture Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE MESSAGE CONCERNING AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1962

To Members of the U.S. Senate:

Passage of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee would be a step toward the development of a farm program that will lead to a sound agriculture economy.

Its enactment would strengthen farm income and curb the cost to the Federal Government.

However, to further these goals, the following amendments are needed:

1. Reinstate more realistic choices in the wheat referendum.
2. Replace the temporary extension of the feed grain program with permanent program.

3. Reinstate the provision that would allow wheat to be grown on feed grain acres or feed grain on wheat acres.

We respectfully request your support of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 with these amendments.

NATIONAL GRANGE.
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WHEAT GROWERS.
MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION.
NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on May 21, I received from the Secretary of Agriculture a letter in which he analyzes the two amendments I have offered, and indicates the difference between the cost of reinstating the old program and the cost of proceeding under the new program.

The administration's long-range program for 1963 would cost, for feed grains, \$644 million, as compared with the cost of \$1,200 million if the 1961-62 program were extended. In so far as wheat is concerned, the cost under the administration's long-range program is estimated at \$1,188 million, in contrast to a cost of \$1,217 million for the emergency law now in effect, if it is merely extended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and the attached data printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 21, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At your request I have considered the amendments you propose to S. 3225, as reported by the Senate Committee on April 27, 1962. I believe the amendments to title III, subtitle A and B would be of enormous consequence to American agriculture, to farmers, to the consumers of food, and to taxpayers. They reconstitute the legislation more nearly as you introduced it in the Congress at the request of the administration on February 2, 1962.

These amendments would provide for a long-range feed grain supply management program in which all producers would participate, if, in a democratic referendum, they chose to do so; and a choice for wheat producers between a wheat program of a permanent nature or no supply adjustment just as the referendum in the feed grain amendment and in existing programs for tobacco and other commodities.

The long-range feed grain amendment will cost the Government about \$4 billion less over the next 4 crop years than extension of emergency programs as proposed in S. 3225.

Government cost of alternative programs for 1963 crops
(In millions)

	Feed grains	Wheat	Feed grains and wheat
Long-range program.....	\$644	\$1,188	\$1,832
Extension of 1961-62 emergency programs.....	1,200	1,217	2,417
Return to 1960 programs.....	1,372	1,465	2,837

The long-range program will reduce surpluses at far lower cost because all producers

would participate to bring production in line with needs. Diversion payments under the long-range amendments would be far lower than with the temporary programs.

Diversion payments under alternative programs

(In millions)

	1963 crop	1963-66 crops
Long-range program.....	\$750	\$1,825
Voluntary programs (S. 3225).....	1,245	4,980
Difference.....	495	3,155

In addition to lower costs and faster surplus reduction, farm income will be increased, benefiting the total population by bringing more money into the economic bloodstream of the Nation. Consumer prices for food—stable during the past year—would not increase.

The amendment on the wheat referendum is clearly needed since the voting provision now in S. 3225 would place the responsibility of choosing a wheat program on the shoulders of the wheatgrowers when such responsibility, I believe, should be borne by the administration and the Congress. The decision which should be placed before the wheatgrowers is whether they desire a supply adjustment program with adequate supports or unlimited production with limited supports. Further considerations on this subject are contained in the attached memorandum.

In view of these facts I strongly concur in your amendments and believe they deserve the full support of all who are interested in a realistic and meaningful farm program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

MEMORANDUM ON S. 3225

The farm programs of the 1950's cost far too much, and they left larger carryovers which committed the Government to continued high costs. Total budget expenditures for all programs administered by the Department of Agriculture rose from \$2.9 billion in the fiscal year 1954 to \$7.1 billion in 1959, and to \$7.2 billion in the current fiscal year, largely because of price support, acreage diversion, storage, and surplus disposal outlays occasioned by excessive production of major farm commodities. Carrying charges alone on wheat and feed grains mounted to \$900 million annually in 1961.

A steady increase in budget expenditures was certain to occur if the pre-1961 programs had been continued for 1961 and 1962 crops. If such programs were again effective beginning with 1963 crops, carryover stocks would increase by the end of the 1966 marketing year to about 4.3 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 2.1 billion bushels of wheat. Annual CCC expenditures for carrying charges on these three grains would exceed \$1¼ billion by the fiscal year 1967.

In contrast, the long-range programs would reduce CCC stocks of corn and grain sorghum to about 1.1 billion bushels and wheat stocks to about 655 million bushels during the same period. Carrying charges on the three grains would be reduced to \$280 million annually by the 1967 fiscal year—nearly \$1 billion less than if the old programs were to operate again.

The 1961-62 emergency feed grain program and the 1962 wheat program have reduced costs compared with a continuation of 1960 programs. But they are responsible programs only as temporary expedients. They were clearly better—for farmers and for taxpayers—than the programs in effect prior to

1961. But they are costly, and their results are uncertain compared with the long-range programs proposed.

Two key amendments to S. 3225 are needed to assure producers of good farm programs and taxpayers of materially lower Government costs.

1. The 1-year extension of the 1962 feed grain program should be replaced by the permanent, mandatory program about as recommended by the President and as considered by the Senate committee, possibly with some minor amendments.

2. The wheat marketing certificate program should be adopted, and the referendum choice between a 2-year extension of the temporary 1962 wheat program, and the marketing certificate program, should be deleted.

REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENTS

1. The voluntary programs are too costly.

(a) The additional cost to the Government of operating the voluntary feed grain and wheat programs in S. 3225 for the 1963 crops, compared with the long-range programs, would be about \$600 million (table 1).

(b) If the voluntary programs were extended further, through the 1966 crops, the cumulative additional cost would be about \$4 billion. This amount is equal to the average yearly Federal income tax payments of nearly 5 million taxpayers; would build 27,000 miles of modern highways; would complete 4,000 watershed projects.

(c) Future budget savings, associated with avoiding new acquisitions of grain and with stock reduction, are far higher under the long-range programs than under the temporary programs (table 2).

(d) Diversion payments alone would be half a billion dollars less in 1963, and more than \$3 billion less for 4 crop years, than with the voluntary programs (table 3).

2. The voluntary programs provide no assurance that stocks will be reduced. In the voluntary feed grain program, noncooperators offset much of the acreage reduction made by cooperators. In 1961, noncooperators increased their plantings by 6 to 7 million acres, offsetting about one-fourth of the acreage reduction diverted and paid for on farms of cooperators. In the voluntary wheat program, smaller carryovers depend on acreage diversion beyond the mandatory 10 percent reduction from 1961 allotments. In both programs, farmer participation is uncertain, and is dependent on crop conditions.

3. The mandatory feed grain program is fair to farmers and the public. It would provide producers a reasonable choice—between good prices and incomes with production restrictions and no production restrictions and low price supports.

(a) Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, wheat and peanuts make this choice nearly every year. Feed grain producers—like other producers—should have an opportunity to approve or reject their program in a referendum. The value of feed grain production plus diversion payments under the program in 1963 would be about \$6.6 billion. If the program were defeated in the referendum, so that price supports were at a level not higher than 50 percent of parity, the value of feed grain production would be less than two-thirds that level.

(b) Feed grain producers outside primary commercial feed grain areas would be largely exempt. From two-thirds to around 90 percent of the producers in most of the States in the Southeast and the Northeast could be exempt from the program because they would have allotments smaller than 25 acres (table 7). Even in States like Wisconsin and Michigan, a sizable percentage of farms could be exempt from the program because their acreages are small. Producers

who chose to be exempt could not vote in the referendum.

If all of these producers eligible chose to be exempt and to plant their 1959-60 acreages, feed grain output would not be increased materially, since so little total acreage is involved. No one can predict how many of the eligible producers would like to be exempt. But surely those producers with small acreages who elected to be subject to the program could be expected to vote in favor of it in the referendum.

(c) Many feed grain producers also have cotton or tobacco allotments. They vote to adopt a program for these crops by 90 to 95 percent majorities each year, because they know the value of a program in which all producers participate.

4. Further reasons for amendments to the wheat section of S. 3225. S. 3225 would provide a choice between a 2-year extension of a familiar program and permanent adoption of the marketing certificate program, which has not been in effect before.

The main fault is that it would provide a possibility of producers choosing a costly program, while turning down the less costly, more flexible certificate program.

The central advantage of the marketing certificate program over the price support program now in effect, apart from lower cost to the Government, is greater flexibility for farmers. The marketing certificates make it possible to limit the price support obligation of the Federal Government. They provide a means of distinguishing between wheat for food and export to be supported at the higher price, and wheat for feed, or for export without a subsidy cost to the Government.

The certificates provide, therefore, a practical means for continuing an attractive price support permanently on wheat consumed for food, and of keeping the door open for reducing the subsidy on exports gradually over time.

The Secretary of Agriculture has indicated his intention of issuing marketing certificates in connection with the 1963 crop on

about 925 million bushels—approximately 85 percent of the estimated national marketing quota. CCC stocks reduction under the marketing certificate program would be an estimated 170 million bushels, while it would amount to only about 100 million bushels under the voluntary program.

The provisions permitting wheat planted on feed grain allotments to be considered as a feed grain should also be reinstated in the Senate bill. This provision would:

(a) Provide farmers with much needed flexibility to produce wheat on feed grain allotments.

(b) Provide a larger supply of quality wheats from which millers and exporters could select their supplies.

(c) Not add to feed supplies, since wheat planted on feed grain acreage would displace other grains.

Detailed comparisons of program costs, ultimate savings, and returns to producers under the alternative programs are in attached tables.

TABLE 1.—Feed grains and wheat: Major elements of CCC costs by crop years

[In millions of dollars]

	1961		1963			
	With 1960 program	Emergency program	With 1960 program	With 1961-62 program	With long-range program	With cropland retirement program
Feed grains:						
Cost of acquisitions.....	880	865	750	932	123	107
Proceeds from dispositions.....	-379	-1,069	-300	-1,285	-550	-429
Export subsidies.....	46	52	45	52	54	23
Carrying charges and interest.....	593	505	710	419	335	335
Public Law 480, excluding export subsidies.....	186	186	167	182	182	167
Subtotal.....	1,326	539	1,372	300	144	203
Payments for land diversion.....		782		1,900	1,500	1,175
Total.....	1,326	1,321	1,372	1,200	644	1,378
Wheat:						
Cost of acquisitions.....		375	592	1962 program 153	100	138
Proceeds from dispositions.....		-417	-420	-454	-425	-547
Export subsidies.....		410	375	313	430	13
Carrying charges and interest.....		300	310	252	225	243
Public Law 480, excluding export subsidies.....		580	608	608	608	608
Subtotal.....		1,248	1,465	872	938	455
Payments for land diversion.....				1,345	1,250	1,705
Total.....		1,248	1,465	1,217	1,188	1,160

¹ Based upon an assumption that the price support would be \$1.20 per bushel for corn and \$1.80 per bushel for wheat. The Department of Agriculture has indicated only that the corn price-support level would be between \$1.20 and \$1.30 if the mandatory feed grain program were in effect in 1963, and that the wheat price-support would be about \$2 per bushel if the marketing certificate program were in effect.

² Diversion payments of \$500 million would be associated with \$1.20 per bushel price

supports for corn; payments of approximately \$400 million would be made if the price support level were at or near \$1.30 per bushel.

³ Payments of \$225 million in the wheat program have also been indicated in some reports.

⁴ Estimated total payments of \$1,880 are attributed to feed grains and wheat even though some of the acreage is diverted from crops not in surplus supply.

TABLE 2.—Feed grains and wheat: Estimated ultimate net savings from supply management programs compared with returning to 1960 programs

[In millions of dollars]

	1961, emergency program	1963			
		With 1960 program	With 1961-62 programs	With long-range program	With cropland retirement program
Feed grains:					
Acquisition costs avoided—net.....	353		341	376	376
Carrying costs and interest avoided.....	1,054		980	1,005	1,005
Diversion payments incurred.....	-782		-900	-500	-1,175
Additional administrative expense incurred.....	-42		-35	-37	-74
Net savings.....	583		386	844	132
Wheat:					
Acquisition costs avoided, net.....			1962 program 207	267	220
Carrying costs and interest avoided.....			335	450	374
Diversion payments incurred.....			-345	-250	-705
Additional administrative expense incurred.....			-13	-13	-42
Net savings.....			184	454	-153

¹ Estimated total payments of \$1,880 are attributed to feed grains and wheat even though some of the acreage is diverted from crops not in surplus supply.

TABLE 3.—Difference in cost to the Government of diversion payments under long-range proposal compared with continuation of 1962 voluntary feed grain and wheat programs under S. 3225 as reported Apr. 27, 1962

(In millions)

Crop and program	Wheat	Feed grains	Total	Crop and program	Wheat	Feed grains	Total
1963 crop:				1966 crop:			
Administration proposal.....	¹ \$250	² \$500	\$750	Administration proposal.....			
S. 3225.....	345	900	1,245	S. 3225.....	\$345	\$900	\$1,245
Difference.....	95	400	495	Difference.....	345	900	1,245
1964 crop:				1963-66 crops:			
Administration proposal.....	¹ 200	² 400	600	Administration proposal.....	625	1,200	1,825
S. 3225.....	345	900	1,245	S. 3225.....	1,380	3,600	4,980
Difference.....	145	500	645	Difference.....	755	2,400	3,155
1965 crop:							
Administration proposal.....	¹ 175	² 300	475				
S. 3225.....	345	900	1,245				
Difference.....	170	600	770				

¹ Diversion payments at approximately these levels would apply with the price support for certificate wheat at \$2 per bushel. The declining schedule of payments indicates a general policy position only, not a determination of the level of payments in future years.

² These payment rates would apply if the price support for corn was \$1.20 per bushel. If the corn price support were around \$1.30 per bushel, payments would range from approximately \$400 million to \$200 million from 1963 to 1965.

TABLE 4.—Feed grains: Estimates for various programs, by crop years

	1961		1963			
	With 1960 program	Emergency program	With 1960 program	With 1961-62 program	Long-range program	Cropland retirement program
Acreage (thousand acres):						
Diverted:						
Soil bank.....	13,943	13,943	12,029	12,029	12,029	12,029
Special programs.....	25,215	25,215	29,500	29,500	33,000	33,000
Harvested.....	124,100	106,763	125,100	105,800	101,500	98,000
Yield (tons per harvest acre).....	1.32	1.32	1.37	1.37	1.37	1.42
Supply (million tons):						
Beginning stocks.....	84.8	84.8	70.4	70.4	70.4	70.4
Production.....	163.0	140.6	166.0	144.6	139.1	139.2
Imports.....	.5	.5	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Total supply.....	248.3	225.9	237.4	216.0	210.5	210.6
Utilization (million tons):						
Domestic.....	137.4	134.9	141.5	138.1	135.0	135.0
Export.....	13.3	13.3	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0
Total use.....	150.7	148.2	155.5	152.0	149.0	149.0
Carryout (million tons).....	97.6	77.7	81.9	64.0	61.5	61.6
Increase (+) or decrease (-) in carryover during year (million tons).....	+12.8	-7.1	+11.5	-6.4	-8.9	-8.8
Payments for land diversion (million dollars).....	782	782	2,900	2,900	2,500	2,500
Season average price to farmers for corn.....	\$0.98	\$1.07	\$0.98	\$1.07	\$1.23	\$1.13

¹ Assumes 3,000,000 more tons of wheat used for feed.

² Estimates of diversion payments and average prices received by farmers are based upon an assumption that the price support in 1963 would be \$1.20 per bushel if the 1961-62 programs were extended. Since program costs would be more than 500,000,000 higher than under the mandatory program, the level of price support would have to be reviewed with a view to reducing program costs.

³ Diversion payments and average prices received by farmers are based on an assumption that the support price would be around \$1.20 per bushel. The price support for corn in 1963 has not been set, but the Department has indicated that under the mandatory program it would be set between \$1.20 and \$1.30 per bushel.

⁴ Represents only that part of 1,880,000,000 in payments which can be specifically ascribed to feed grain acreage.

TABLE 5.—Wheat: Estimates for various programs, by crop years

	1961 program	1963			
		With 1961 program	With 1962 program	Long range	Cropland retirement program
Acreage (thousand acres):					
Diverted:					
Soil bank.....	3,163	2,729	2,729	2,729	2,729
Special programs.....	55,648	57,000	48,300	45,800	51,000
Planted.....	51,620	53,500	43,100	40,600	47,000
Harvested.....	23.9	25.0	25.5	25.5	25.5
Yield (bushels per acre).....					
Supply (million bushels):					
Beginning stocks.....	1,412	1,295	1,295	1,295	1,295
Production.....	1,235	1,340	1,100	1,035	1,200
Imports.....	8	8	8	5	5
Total supply.....	2,655	2,643	2,403	2,335	2,500
Utilization (million bushels):					
Domestic.....	590	603	585	585	700
Export.....	685	625	625	625	625
Total use.....	1,275	1,228	1,210	1,210	1,325
Carryout (million bushels).....	1,380	1,415	1,193	1,125	1,175
Increase (+) or decrease (-) in carryover during year.....	-32	+120	-102	-170	-120
Payments for land diversion (million dollars).....	250	345	250	250	110
Season average price to farmers.....	\$1.84	\$1.75	\$1.50	\$2.05	\$1.35

¹ Estimates take into consideration "small farm" base acreages of about 6,000,000 acres under Administration proposal but about 11,000,000 acres under the 1962 program.

² Diversion payments and average prices received by farmers are based upon an assumption that the 1963 price support for wheat would be \$1.80 if the 1962 wheat program were extended to the 1963 crop, but that the price support would be about \$2 if the marketing certificate program were in effect.

³ Represents only that part of \$1,880,000,000 in total payments which can be specifically ascribed to wheat acreage. If all payments are prorated to wheat and feed grains, this becomes \$705,000,000.

⁴ Feed and seed wheat value assumed to be \$1.40 per bushel, except under cropland retirement program.

TABLE 6.—Estimated value of production of wheat and feed grains under various programs, by crop years

	1961		1963			
	With 1960 program	Programs	With 1960 programs	With 1962 programs	Long-range programs	Cropland retirement program
Wheat:						
Season average price per bushel to farmers ¹		\$1.84	\$1.75	\$1.80	\$2.05	\$1.35
Value of production (millions) ¹		2,228	2,310	1,940	2,057	1,620
Payments for land diversion (millions).....				345	250	² 110
Total value plus payments (millions).....		2,228	2,310	2,285	2,307	1,730
Feed grains:						
Season average price to farmers for corn:						
Per bushel.....	\$0.98	1.07	0.98	1.07	1.23	1.13
Per ton.....	35.00	38.20	35.00	38.20	43.95	40.35
Value of production of all feed grains, basis price per ton of corn (millions).....	5,705	5,372	5,810	5,525	6,127	5,609
Payments for land diversion (millions).....		782		900	500	² 800
Total value plus payments.....	5,705	6,154	5,810	6,425	6,627	6,409

¹ Wheat used for feed and seed is computed at \$1.40 per bushel except for the cropland retirement program.

² Represents only that part of \$1,880,000,000 on total payments which can be ascribed specifically to wheat or feed grain acreage. The remainder would apply to land diverted from other crops.

TABLE 7.—Feed grains: Estimated applicability of 25-acre exemption under the provisions of the administration feed grain program ¹

State	Estimated number of farms with bases of 25 acres or less ²	Percentage of farms with 25-acre base or less	Feed grain acreage represented by farms with 25 acres or less (thousands)	Acreage on exempt farms as percent of total acreage	State	Estimated number of farms with bases of 25 acres or less ²	Percentage of farms with 25-acre base or less	Feed grain acreage represented by farms with 25 acres or less (thousands)	Acreage on exempt farms as percent of total acreage
Maine.....	1,079	96	8.5	81	North Carolina.....	128,926	88	1,059.6	54
New Hampshire.....	906	93	8.1	74	South Carolina.....	50,241	87	426.4	51
Vermont.....	3,482	90	37.1	69	Georgia.....	45,508	60	453.4	17
Massachusetts.....	1,684	88	17.4	61	Florida.....	6,079	51	69.0	12
Rhode Island.....	240	83	3.0	54	Kentucky.....	82,526	82	686.4	40
Connecticut.....	1,802	85	21.9	58	Tennessee.....	79,944	82	661.9	43
New York.....	31,045	81	319.8	49	Alabama.....	62,844	73	642.9	31
New Jersey.....	3,698	64	44.9	26	Mississippi.....	82,176	89	722.1	58
Pennsylvania.....	56,586	81	857.2	69	Arkansas.....	31,121	91	210.7	57
Ohio.....	57,907	55	649.2	17	Louisiana.....	31,061	91	259.2	56
Indiana.....	39,056	39	476.1	9	Oklahoma.....	9,131	34	61.1	7
Illinois.....	25,749	20	296.4	3	Texas.....	28,442	36	264.1	4
Michigan.....	45,283	63	545.0	26	Montana.....	3,899	25	59.3	3
Wisconsin.....	64,528	61	796.0	28	Idaho.....	4,937	54	58.7	10
Minnesota.....	28,001	25	357.6	5	Wyoming.....	1,098	39	13.2	10
Iowa.....	18,164	12	236.8	2	Colorado.....	390	10	3.0	1
Missouri.....	46,584	48	512.5	12	New Mexico.....	474	26	5.8	3
North Dakota.....	2,375	6	31.7	1	Arizona.....	301	23	2.3	2
South Dakota.....	2,872	7	22.4	1	Utah.....	5,538	70	53.6	39
Nebraska.....	4,231	6	52.4	1	Nevada.....	216	54	2.3	15
Kansas.....	16,690	24	173.5	4	Washington.....	2,334	35	21.9	3
Delaware.....	1,840	50	22.3	14	Oregon.....	4,734	53	48.7	10
Maryland.....	11,099	66	113.9	23	California.....	1,352	18	22.6	1
Virginia.....	56,386	89	463.4	59					
West Virginia.....	20,063	96	101.3	75	United States.....	1,204,532	54	11,976.5	12

¹ The exemption applies to base acreage in H. R. 11222 and to acreage allotments in the section which was deleted from the Senate bill (S. 2786) before it was reported as S. 3225.

² Includes corn, grain sorghums and barley. If oats is included, as in H. R. 11222, the number and percentage of farms would be smaller in most States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and attached tabulations from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIER: This is in reply to your letter of May 11 in which you raised some questions about pending feed grain legislation. I appreciate your concern over the merits of the program of the administration, but I cannot agree with your analysis of the results of that program.

You cited two main problems in connection with the administration's feed grain program compared with an extension of the existing voluntary program:

1. You believe that farmers would turn the administration program down in a referendum this year, and therefore, that it ought not be passed now;

2. You believe the existing voluntary program, with amendments, can be made materially less costly to the Government, and ought to be extended for a year.

Choice of the mandatory program would not prove to be "tragic" as you state, whether farmers approved the program in a referendum or not. Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts take the risk of a referendum each year. They vote—freely and democratically—for a program which supports farm income while protecting the Government against excessive costs, or a program which would virtually terminate production adjustment and price support operations in the particular commodity. The alternatives to providing producers an opportunity to choose a supply management program are continued excessively high costs to the public, or an end to effective price supports for feed grains.

I have great confidence in the judgment of American farmers. I believe that they would choose wisely between alternative feed grain programs if they have the opportunity. Under the administration proposal, they can elect to reduce their plantings in order to continue good and stable prices, or they can elect to plant without limit and to take the very low market prices which must result. We may disagree with their choice if they reject the program, but we should not deny them the right to make it.

Your concern that the feed grain program would fail in the referendum is based primarily on the claim that producers in deficit areas would vote heavily against the program, thus denying the program to those producers most affected—in the Midwest and Plains. This claim ignores the fact that most of the producers who would vote are in the Midwest and Plains, and it goes against all experience in referendums for other commodities.

Two key facts stand out:

1. Most producers in the Southeast and Northeast, and up to half the producers in some Western States would have the option of continuing to plant their historic feed grain acreage, or to participate in the program in order to be eligible for price support, conservation payments, and to vote in the referendum.

2. Producers in deficit areas who either have larger acreages, or who voluntarily elect to participate with their small acreage, would have good reasons, based on their farm situation and on experience in other programs to favor the program.

There would be about 2.2 million farms with feed grain base acreage under the provisions of the mandatory program as considered but not approved by the Senate

committee, a program applicable to corn, barley, and sorghum. Of these farms, 1.2 million, or 54 percent, would be subject to the program only if they deliberately elected to participate (see attached table). They would be ineligible for price support, but would benefit materially from the price support program, and could harvest an acreage equal to their feed grain base acreage.

Some of these small producers would choose to be subject to the program, and would become eligible to vote in the referendum. Having elected to participate, they would surely vote for the program in the referendum. It is unbelievable that any substantial number of producers with small acreages would sign up to participate in a program from which they would otherwise be exempt, in order to vote "no" in the referendum.

Two immediate conclusions follow: (1) Most producers with small acreages will not vote in the referendum; (2) those who do, will vote "yes." Clearly, they must be in favor of the program in which they voluntarily decided to participate.

You expressed concern in your letter that producers outside the main feed grain producing areas would carry undue weight in any feed grain referendum. A tentative distribution of total feed grain farms is shown in the attached table, broken down by farms with over 25 acres, which could be exempt. Clearly, the bulk of the eligible voters in a referendum would be heavily concentrated in the Midwest and the Plains (col. 1 below).

	Percentage distribution of farms with more than 25 acres	Percentage distribution of eligible farms if 1/4 of farms with less than 25 acres chose to participate
Northeast (11 States).....	3.0	4.4
Southeast (12 States).....	15.7	24.3
Midwest (8 States).....	52.7	47.2
Plains (7 States).....	25.2	20.9
Mountain (10 States).....	3.5	3.2

Together, eight Midwestern and Plains States which produce most of the corn, oats, and sorghum grain and a large share of the barley, would have about 78 percent of the voters certain to be eligible for the referendum.

If one-fourth of all producers with less than 25 acres of feed grains chose to participate, the Midwest and Plains would still have 68 percent of the eligible voters (column 2 above). And in this case, they would have the support of the producers in other areas who had voluntarily elected to participate and would probably vote almost solidly for the program. In the Southeast, up to one-third of the feed grain acreage will be diverted this year. Similar heavy voluntary participation by producers with small acreages under the mandatory program would add significantly to the prospects for a favorable vote in the referendum.

Further assistance in assuring a favorable vote in the feed grain referendum would result from the fact that many tobacco and cotton producers, who know the value of farm programs, would be voting. Similar overlapping of allotments will be found also in wheat areas, where referendum votes have had large majorities.

A factor often ignored is that even in feed-deficit areas, many producers sell all or a large part of the grain they produce. Like Corn Belt producers, they would be concerned with the effect on market prices of failure of the referendum. About half the corn grown in North Carolina and Georgia is sold from the farm; one-fourth to one-third of South Carolina, Kentucky, and Alabama corn is sold by farmers.

Relatively little of the barley produced in the West is fed on the farms where it is grown. About 90 percent of California production, three-fourths of Oregon and Washington production, and far the larger share of the barley produced in all major States, is marketed by producers. They would be concerned with barley prices in the event the program did not carry, just as they are concerned with wheat prices when they vote in the wheat referendum.

The same is true for sorghum grain. Nearly 90 percent of Texas production, and two-thirds or more of Kansas and Nebraska production is marketed. In most cases, it is marketed by a producer who votes "Yes" regularly in a cotton or a wheat referendum, because he knows the value of price support.

Your contention that a voluntary feed grain program could be made less costly to the Government by some amendments to the present program, if that were the only course of action open at this time, has little validity. If price support for all commodities were available only to those producers who participate in the feed grain program, and if other programs of the Department were limited to cooperators, no substantial additional incentive for participation or any large savings in costs would be realized. The primary incentive in a voluntary program must necessarily be payments offered by the Government. If the participation necessary to make a voluntary program effective is to be secured, Government costs could be reduced only nominally by requiring producers to participate in the feed grain program in order to get technical assistance, loans, and price supports for other commodities. Government payments must be reduced sharply and immediately. They cannot be continued indefinitely, as they must be under a voluntary program.

Compared with the nominal cost reductions which could possibly be made in the voluntary program, the mandatory program is expected to make it possible to reduce the payments to \$400 to \$500 million in the 1963 crop year—50 percent below present levels—and to terminate payments beginning with the 1966 crop. The difference in payments and other public costs, for extension of the voluntary feed grain program compared with the mandatory program would be approximately \$3 billion in only 4 years—1963 to 1966.

Your concern that if the feed grain program were rejected in the referendum this year, it would be rejected again in 1963 is not well grounded. The price support of \$1.20 per bushel for corn announced for the 1962 marketing year would support cash prices during part of the 1962 marketing year, even if there were to be a much lower price support in 1963. But the prospect of a large 1963 crop and a very low support level would put severe pressure on cash and futures prices in the spring and summer of 1963. Prices would be weak, and farmers would be expecting extremely low market prices in mid-summer 1963, when the second feed grain referendum would be held.

Your other proposal, to tie the wheat, feed grain, and possibly cotton and tobacco referendum votes together, so that a vote for one would be a vote for the other, might help somewhat, since it may bind some producers to a favorable feed grain vote who might otherwise oppose feed grains. But it would not be in keeping with the long precedent in producer referendums, and it would severely limit the freedom of choice of producers. Cotton, tobacco, wheat, rice, and peanut programs have passed dozens of referendums on their merits. The feed grains program can do the same.

You indicated also your support for the wheat marketing certificate program, although you coupled it with an extension of the voluntary feed grain program. The wheat program is very similar to the marketing certificate program approved by the Con-

gress in 1956. It provides a better wheat program for producers and for taxpayers at the same time. The wheat program, however, simply does for wheat what we have proposed to do also for feed grains in the administration program. The two mandatory programs should be kept together.

I hope you will support efforts to amend S. 3225, to make it an effective instrument of the farm policy.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Estimated distribution of feed grain farms in a mandatory program applicable to corn, sorghum grain, and barley¹

State and region	Estimated number of farms		
	Total	With 25 acres or less	With more than 25 acres
Northeast:			
Maine.....	1,126	1,079	47
New Hampshire.....	970	906	64
Vermont.....	3,878	3,452	396
Massachusetts.....	1,911	1,684	227
Rhode Island.....	291	240	51
Connecticut.....	2,114	1,802	312
New York.....	38,304	31,045	7,259
New Jersey.....	5,643	3,608	2,035
Pennsylvania.....	69,804	56,586	13,218
Delaware.....	3,694	1,840	1,854
Maryland.....	16,890	11,069	5,791
Total.....	144,625	113,371	31,254
Midwest:			
Ohio.....	105,817	57,907	47,910
Indiana.....	99,891	39,056	60,835
Illinois.....	132,133	25,749	106,384
Michigan.....	72,239	45,283	26,956
Wisconsin.....	105,809	64,528	41,281
Minnesota.....	112,305	28,001	84,304
Iowa.....	155,791	18,164	137,627
Missouri.....	97,771	46,584	51,187
Total.....	881,756	325,272	556,484
Plains:			
North Dakota.....	39,192	2,375	36,817
South Dakota.....	41,063	2,872	38,191
Nebraska.....	71,409	4,231	67,178
Kansas.....	69,186	16,690	52,496
Oklahoma.....	27,082	9,131	17,951
Texas.....	78,837	28,442	50,395
Colorado.....	3,869	1,098	2,771
Total.....	330,638	64,839	265,799
South and Southeast:			
Virginia.....	63,032	56,386	6,696
West Virginia.....	20,907	20,063	844
North Carolina.....	146,918	128,926	17,992
South Carolina.....	57,609	50,241	7,368
Georgia.....	75,293	45,308	29,785
Florida.....	11,905	6,079	5,826
Kentucky.....	101,117	82,526	18,591
Tennessee.....	96,965	79,944	17,021
Alabama.....	85,778	62,844	22,934
Mississippi.....	92,308	82,176	10,132
Arkansas.....	34,322	31,121	3,201
Louisiana.....	34,265	9,131	25,134
Total.....	820,469	654,945	165,524
West:			
Montana.....	15,638	3,899	11,739
Idaho.....	9,209	4,937	4,272
Wyoming.....	2,820	1,098	1,722
New Mexico.....	1,813	474	1,339
Arizona.....	1,297	301	996
Utah.....	7,912	5,538	2,374
Nevada.....	399	216	183
Washington.....	6,754	2,334	4,420
Oregon.....	8,862	4,734	4,128
California.....	7,658	1,352	6,306
Total.....	62,362	24,883	37,479
United States.....	2,239,850	1,183,310	1,056,540

¹ Based on rough estimates, since no comprehensive tabulation exists at this time, and could be made only when the program became effective.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table from the Commodity Credit Corporation, which indicates the carrying charges—in fact, all charges merely in order to handle the various commodities which that Corporation has on hand at the

present time. For the fiscal year 1961, the total cost—which includes transportation, storage, interest and other carrying charges—is \$1,154 million; and 78 percent of that huge cost is attributable to wheat, corn, and other feed grains.

No matter what analysis is made, the plain fact is that the programs for the feed grains and for wheat have been extremely costly.

Price support losses for corn alone since the beginning of the program amount to \$2,188,789,461. For wheat \$1,798,261,275 is the amount of price support losses, \$557,837,104 for export subsidies because the domestic price is higher than the world price, and if I remember correctly, over a billion dollars for export subsidies under the International Wheat Agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing carrying charges, including storage, handling, transportation, and interest costs on Commodity Credit Corporation stocks for the fiscal year 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation carrying charges, resale loan payments, and imputed interest, fiscal year 1961

[In millions of dollars]

Item	Transportation cost	Storage handling cost	Other carrying charges	Total carrying charges	Imputed interest ¹	Total carrying charges and interest	Resale loan payments	Total carrying charges, interest, and resale payments	Allocation of loan collateral settlements to—		Adjusted total, carrying charges, interest, and resale loan payments
									Storage and handling	Resale loan payments	
Basic commodities:											
Corn	\$28.1	\$149.0		\$177.1	\$108.5	\$285.6	\$53.1	\$338.7	\$3.2	\$8.6	\$350.5
Cornmeal	(?)	(?)		(?)	.8	.8		.8			.8
Cotton, extra long staple	(?)	.3		.3	.6	.9		.9			.9
Cotton, upland	.3	22.6		22.9	36.1	59.0		59.0			59.0
Peanuts, farmers' stock	.1	1.4	\$1.5	3.0	.3	3.3		3.3			3.3
Peanuts, shelled	.4	1.1	1.7	3.2	.8	4.0		4.0			4.0
Peanut butter					.3	.3		.3			.3
Rice, milled	1.0	.5		1.5	1.9	3.4		3.4			3.4
Rice, rough	.3	1.9		2.2	.8	3.0		3.0			3.0
Tobacco					13.4	13.4		13.4			13.4
Wheat	92.9	176.4	(?)	269.3	112.6	381.9	14.3	396.2			396.2
Wheat flour	(?)	(?)		(?)	3.2	3.2		3.2			3.2
Total, basic	123.1	353.2	3.2	479.5	279.3	758.8	67.4	\$26.2	3.2	8.6	\$38.0
Mandatory nonbasic:											
Butter	1.0	2.3	1.8	5.1	3.6	8.7		8.7			8.7
Cheese	.1	.1	.2	.4	.3	.7		.7			.7
Milk, nonfat dry	6.8	2.0		8.8	1.8	10.6		10.6			10.6
Milk, fluid					1.0	1.0		1.0			1.0
Subtotal, dairy products	7.9	4.4	2.0	14.3	6.7	21.0		21.0			21.0
Honey	(?)	(?)		(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)			(?)
Barley	6.8	9.6		16.4	4.3	20.7	6.4	27.1			27.1
Oats	.8	1.3	.7	2.8	1.1	3.9	4.1	8.0			8.0
Rye	.9	.7		1.6	.4	2.0	(?)	2.0			2.0
Sorghums, grain	17.2	88.9		106.1	33.5	139.6	3.1	142.7	3.5	3.0	149.2
Tung oil	(?)	.1		.1	2.0	2.1		2.1			2.1
Total, mandatory nonbasic	33.6	105.0	2.7	141.3	48.0	189.3	13.6	202.9	3.5	3.0	209.4
Other nonbasic:											
Beans, dry edible	.6	.8	.4	1.8	.2	2.0		2.0			2.0
Flaxseed	(?)	(?)		(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)			(?)
Naval stores:											
Rosin					(?)	(?)		(?)			(?)
Turpentine		(?)		(?)	(?)	(?)		(?)			(?)
Soybeans	.1	1.3		1.4	1.2	2.6		2.6			2.6
Vegetable oils		.1		.1	.1	.2		.2			.2
Total, other nonbasic	.7	2.2	.4	3.3	1.5	4.8		4.8			4.8
Strategic and critical materials	6.7	1.7	1.1	9.5	1.4	10.9		10.9			10.9
Total, price support program	164.1	462.1	7.4	633.6	330.2	963.8	81.0	1,044.8	6.7	11.6	1,063.1
Storage facilities program					5.7	5.7		5.7			5.7
Supply and foreign purchase program	(?)	(?)		(?)		(?)		(?)			(?)
Special milk program					1.6	1.6		1.6			1.6
Administrative and nonadministrative expenses					2.9	2.9		2.9			2.9
Interest					13.2	13.2		13.2			13.2
CCC capital stock					3.5	3.5		3.5			3.5
Certificates held by banks					11.6	11.6		11.6			11.6
Public Law 480:											
Title I					43.8	43.8		43.8			43.8
Title II					2.5	2.5		2.5			2.5
International Wheat Agreement					1.8	1.8		1.8			1.8
National Wool Act					4.0	4.0		4.0			4.0
Loans to Secretary					.3	.3		.3			.3
Total, CCC	164.1	462.1	7.4	633.6	421.1	1,054.7	81.0	1,135.7	6.7	11.6	1,154.0

¹ Includes interest on prior years' unreimbursed losses.
² Less than \$50,000.

³ Wheat, corn, grain sorghum; 78 percent of this for carrying charges only; \$500,000,000 for corn and grain sorghum.

Source: USDA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon we were discussing the costs of the present emergency feed-grain program as compared to the costs of the conservation reserve program which has been in effect since 1956.

Under the emergency feed-grain program the total cost amounted to \$825 million, of which \$43 million was for

administrative costs and \$782 million for payments to farmers for diverted acres.

The payment to farmers was for the diversion of corn and grain sorghum acreage, and averaged \$31 per acre. The average payment per acre for all contracts under the conservation reserve program amounted to only \$11.85 per acre. However, the type land taken out of production under this program,

generally, was less productive than that land taken out under the emergency feed-grain program.

This is adequately borne out by the payments for land diversion under the now expired acreage reserve program of the soil bank. Under that program the average payment amounted to \$31 per acre for the 50.7 million acres diverted from the production of crops.

In this connection, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a table showing a multitude of facts concerning the so-called soil bank program.

There being no objection, the table is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Costs of the soil bank program	
Payments made to farmers through June 30, 1961:	Million
Acreage reserve.....	\$1,549
Conservation reserve.....	923
Total.....	2,472
Payments to be made to farmers after June 30, 1961, under outstanding conservation reserve contracts.....	1,755
Total payments to end of program.....	4,227

Per acre payments made on voluntary acreage reserve

Increase each year:	Per acre
1956 program.....	\$21
1957 program.....	29
1958 program.....	41

Average for aggregate of 50.7 million acres placed in reserve over 3-year period was \$31 per acre.

Payments on conservation reserve contracts to end of program (\$2,678 million on 28.7 million acres) will average \$93 per acre.

Cost of administering all soil bank programs:	
Through June 30, 1961, totaled.....	\$158.5
Highest fiscal year cost was in 1958.....	50
Total soil bank cost to June 30, 1961 (payments plus expenses).....	2,600
Total cost to end of program (1971).....	4,400

History of acreage reserve

Corn acreage signed up:
In 1956, 5.3 million acres—average of 16.9 acres per agreement.
In 1957, 5.2 million acres—average of 16.2 acres per agreement.
In 1958, 6.7 million acres—average of 18.7 acres per agreement.
Total of \$644.8 million spent on corn or an average of \$38 per acre.

Average rate per acre:	
1956.....	\$33.80
1957.....	37.53
1958.....	42.39

Maximum rates 1958 program:

Iowa.....	64.00
Illinois.....	69.00

Wheat acreage signed up:

In 1956, 5.7 million acres—average of 51.1 acres per agreement.
In 1957, 12.8 million acres—average of 54.9 acres per agreement.
In 1958, 5.3 million acres—average of 30.3 acres per agreement.

Total of \$377.0 million spent on wheat or an average of \$16 per acre.

Average rate per acre:	
1956.....	\$7.89
1957.....	18.06
1958.....	19.87

Maximum rates 1958 program:

Kansas.....	31.00
Washington.....	52.00

CONSERVATION RESERVE RENTAL RATES

The figure of \$11.85 per acre is frequently used as the cost of the conservation reserve program annual rental. This was the average for all contracts entered into during the life of the program (1956 through 1960).

However, on contracts signed up in the last 2 years of the program (19.3 million acres), the average was \$13.31 per acre.

In major corn-producing States the rates were considerably higher:

State	Rental rate	
	1960 contracts	1956-60 contracts
Iowa.....	\$18.70	\$18.12
Illinois.....	17.23	17.24
Indiana.....	18.42	18.40
Ohio.....	17.40	17.23
Minnesota.....	13.42	11.23
Nebraska.....	12.81	12.00
Missouri.....	14.94	14.14
Wisconsin.....	14.12	13.77

On all acres signed under the CRP, the total rental and conservation practice assistance paid under contracts to their expiration date will average \$93 per acre.

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS IN MINNESOTA, NEW JERSEY, NORTH CAROLINA, NORTH DAKOTA, TENNESSEE, AND VIRGINIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Thursday, I stated my intention, when S. 2965 was considered, to propose an amendment increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for an emergency program of public works. My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202—for the fiscal year 1963—212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961." This would increase the total authorized to be appropriated from \$600 million to \$2,645 million for a one-shot emergency program of public works aimed at getting back to work the un-

employed in the 933 pockets of economic distress scattered across the Nation.

As I indicated in my remarks last Thursday, some of my colleagues on the Senate Public Works Committee expressed doubts as to whether the sum of \$2,645 million could be economically utilized. In order to allay these fears, I telegraphed the Governors of all the States, asking them to advise me of the amounts which can economically be expended in their States for public-works projects that can be completed in 27 months.

I reported, on Thursday, that I had heard from 12 States which indicated that more than \$1.5 billion could be utilized profitably in those States, alone.

Since then, I have received additional responses from the States of Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Tennessee, and Virginia, indicating they have ready public works projects to employ the unemployed in distressed areas, totaling at least an additional \$212 million, bringing to over \$1.7 billion the total, so far, from the 17 States having distressed areas which have responded.

In the areas suffering from prolonged high rates of unemployment, we must be prepared to act effectively, and now. Let it not be said of us that we responded with too little supplied too late to the pleas of the unemployed.

We have responded magnificently and with munificence to the pleas of the unemployed in the underdeveloped countries abroad. We cannot afford to be less generous with our own unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent that the additional replies referred to by me today be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
St. Paul, Minn., May 18, 1962.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is in reply to your wire requesting a list of public works projects for distressed areas in Minnesota.

The results of a community survey, in the form of an itemized list of projects, are attached. I would appreciate being kept advised of developments.

Cordially yours,

ELMER L. ANDERSEN,
Governor.

State of Minnesota public works projects for distressed areas

Community	Amount	Nature of project	Employees	27-month complete?	Match funds?
Aurora.....	\$40,000	Curbs; gutters; sidewalks; public parks and picnic grounds; hockey rink; and blacktop streets.	125.....	Yes.....	Yes.
Buhl.....	400,000	Street and alley paving; sewerline installation and repairs; steam tunnels.	50.....	Yes.....	Very small portion.
Chisholm.....	1,750,000	Water works; interceptor sanitary sewers; streets and sidewalks, buildings and grounds.	100.....	Yes.....	For part of project.
Hibbing.....	900,000	Incinerator; resurfacing sewer for water; sidewalks, curbs, gutters, street widening, and street paving.	200.....	Yes.....	For any combination of projects.
Tower.....	2,500	Improve Hoodoo Point at Lake Vermilion campgrounds.....	10.....	Yes.....	\$1,000.
Ely.....	380,000	Street improvements; sewer construction; water main construction; park improvements.	40 for each.....	Yes.....	Partly.
Virginia.....	500,000	Curb and sidewalk repairs and replacements; storm and sanitary sewer repairs; creek improvement.	100.....	Yes.....	No.
Fayal Township.....	85,000	Town hall and garage; blacktop and ditching township roads; rebuild sewage system in township location; build new roads.	100.....	Yes.....	Yes.
Blwabik.....	25,000	Blacktop streets; gutter work, curb and storm sewers; cemetery expansion; repair buildings; fire alarm system; city drainage and repair septic unit.	Indefinite.....	Yes.....	Yes.
Gilbert.....	60,000	Repair sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and storm sewers.....	Indefinite.....	Yes.....	Yes.

State of Minnesota public works projects for distressed areas—Continued

Community	Amount	Nature of project	Employees	27-month complete?	Match funds?
Eveleth.....	508,500	New sidewalks and repair sidewalks, streets, hippodrome roof, curbs, and gutters, storm sewers, waterplant, waterline and greens at Eveleth Golf Course; clean out drain line at Virginia-Eveleth Airport; clean sanitary sewer lines and new waterline to serve St. Mary's Lake.	10,850 man-days.....	Yes.....	No.
Mountain Iron.....	120,000	Street repairs, sidewalks and alleys; life station; repair water and light plant; repair two steam boilers and water and steam and power lines.	25.....	Yes.....	Minimal.
McKinley.....	7,000	New compressor and water pump (deep well) for community.....	Indefinite.....	Yes.....	No.

Additional distressed area projects:

Beltrami County road construction to employ Indian labor; cost, approximately \$500,000.
Construction of Duluth Arena-Auditorium; cost, approximately \$25,000.STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, N.J., May 17, 1962.HON. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: At your request I am sending you a tabulation of public works projects in economically distressed countries of New Jersey and those counties which would qualify under the proposed public works legislation.

Applications for planning these projects were made to the Community Facilities Administration under the terms of the program for assistance to public works planning, section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954. All are in various stages of planning or construction. It appears that most could be completed within a period of 27 months.

In addition to these projects, there are various public works projects which are constructed without the benefit of Federal aid and others which are deferred for lack of

financial resources. These would be greatly aided by the proposed Federal program.

Not included in this tabulation is an estimated \$75 million which will be required for the construction of a protective buffer strip along the entire coast of the State to provide protection from storms such as that which inflicted severe damage on March 6, 1962.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. HUGHES,
Governor.

County and municipality	Type of project	Estimated cost of project	County and municipality	Type of project	Estimated cost of project
*Atlantic County: Pleasantville.....	Sanitary sewer system.....	\$750,000	Morris County—Continued		
Burlington County:			Roxbury Township.....	Sewerage system.....	\$2,826,000
Pemberton Township.....	Sanitary sewer treatment plant.....	628,000	Parsippany-Troy Hills Township.....	Sanitary sewer system.....	3,100,000
Medford Township.....	Sanitary sewers.....	991,330	Denville.....	Sewer system.....	1,473,000
Burlington Township.....	Storm sewers.....	213,543	Lincoln Park.....	Sewerage system.....	1,262,000
Mount Holly.....	do.....	101,350	Do.....	Water supply.....	197,000
Palmyra.....	High school.....	990,000	Butler.....	Water system.....	981,000
Medford Township.....	Sanitary sewers.....	324,500	Roxbury Township.....	do.....	1,345,000
Camden County:			*Ocean County:		
Lindenwood.....	Sewer system treatment plant.....	1,733,750	Lakehurst.....	Extensions and additions to sanitary sewerage collection.....	428,165
Camden (city).....	Storm sewers.....	1,037,000		Comprehensive sanitary sewer system.....	3,165,000
Collingswood.....	School facilities.....	1,482,000	Dover Sewerage Authority.....	Water system, new water sources.....	255,000
Pine Hill.....	Sewer and water system.....	1,500,000	Long Beach Township.....	Comprehensive sewer system.....	800,000
Camden (city).....	Incinerator.....	3,000,000	Plumsted Township.....	Engineering study of water problems.....	559,000
Clementon.....	Sewerage plant and system.....	1,157,940	Lakewood Township.....		
Lawnside.....	Sewerage treatment plant.....	520,000			
Camden (city).....	Storm sewers.....	2,473,000			
*Cape May County:			*Passaic County:		
Ocean City.....	Sewerage.....	1,050,230	Little Falls.....	Alterations and additions to existing sewerage treatment plant.....	359,000
Wildwood.....	Incinerator.....	386,000		Sewerage facilities.....	2,280,000
*Cumberland County: None.			Passaic Valley sewerage commissioners.....	Sanitary sewer system treatment plant.....	1,725,000
Essex County:			Pompton Lakes.....	Urban renewal site sewer and storm drains.....	581,395
Essex County Board of Freeholders.....	Administration building.....	18,963,000	Paterson.....	Pumping station.....	(*)
East Orange.....	Addition to elementary school.....	(?)	Passaic Valley sewerage commissioners.....		
Gloucester County: National park (borough).....	Sanitary sewer system.....	707,825	Totowa.....	Sewage treatment plant.....	705,900
*Monmouth County:			Passaic (city).....	Redesign of downtown Passaic.....	1,990,380
Union Beach.....	Sewer system and treatment plant.....	1,500,000	Wayne Township.....	Sanitary sewerage system treatment plant and pumping station.....	1,266,000
Englishtown.....	Water supply and distribution system.....	365,000			
Little Silver.....	Sewer system treatment plant.....	1,000,000	Totowa.....	Sewage disposal plant.....	947,424
Asbury Park.....	Sanitary trunk sewer.....	615,690	Union County:		
Morris County:			Scotch Plains.....	Sanitary sewer system.....	2,000,000
Wharton.....	Sanitary sewer system.....	(?)	Storm sewers.....	1,000,000	
East Hanover.....	Water system.....	(?)	Elizabeth.....	Library.....	750,000
Randolph Township.....	Water supply.....	(?)			
Netcong.....	Sanitary sewer system plant.....	(?)			
Butler.....	do.....	372,000			
Chatham Township.....	Sewerage facilities.....	1,990,000			

*Counties designated as redevelopment areas under Public Law 87-27.

RALEIGH, N.C., May 18, 1962.

Re Standby Public Works Act.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Replies from about 20 percent of communities in North Carolina counties qualified under Area Redevelopment Act indicate willingness to spend approximately \$7 million for immediate public works on 50-50 matching basis. Greater proportion of Federal money would undoubtedly increase total which could be spent.

GEORGE M. STEPHENS,
Governor's Office.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, N. Dak., May 17, 1962.Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I regret the delay in responding to your telegram of April 18, inquiring about the public works projects that could be used in North Dakota.

While we certainly could use approximately \$100 million in North Dakota alone, I think some of the more feasible projects have been cited to me by Hans Walker, Jr., the executive director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission. In addition, we have pending construction of dams and reclamation projects totaling \$65 million.

I am forwarding to you a copy of the letter I have received from Hans Walker for your information.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

NORTH DAKOTA

INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMISSION,
New Town, N. Dak., May 1, 1962.

Re public work projects.

Gov. WILLIAM L. GUY,
Capitol Building,
Bismarck, N. Dak.

DEAR GOVERNOR GUY: This is in reply to your letter of the 25th regarding possible public work projects, the estimated costs

and man hours of work which might be provided.

It would seem that the projects which might be carried on under this act would be those similar to the projects carried on under the old CCC rather than those under the PWA where projects included public auditoriums, etc. Suggestions made herein for projects are for those which might be carried on with Indian labor on reservations; however, some could be carried on outside reservations also.

As you know, Indian reservations were designated as distressed areas under the Redevelopment Act (OEDP). The type of project which might be carried on under that act, however, is quite different from those which may be carried on under this public works bill. The OEDP is designed to provide work on a permanent basis through the development of an industry or an enterprise. Some of the projects, therefore, which are possible under this public works bill are not possible under OEDP. The objection to some projects has been that they do not alleviate underemployment or

unemployment on a permanent basis. It seems therefore that funds under this bill would be necessary to provide immediate employment while efforts can be continued to development of more permanent employment.

The enclosed telegram requests possible projects, cost estimates, and man-hours of work which might be provided. There is submitted for your consideration projects as follows:

1. Project to clear driftwood from Garrison Reservoir: The Garrison Reservoir area was heavily wooded and was not cleared prior to flooding. The driftwood lying on the beaches and floating creates a definite hazard to boating and recreation. It is also a hazard to the machinery at the outlet of the dam. The Army Engineers, I understand, expend funds each year to keep this wood away from the dam outlet. The wood gathered could be stockpiled for use by needy Indians to use for fuel.

One hundred men could commence work immediately with flat barges and power saws. It is estimated that the work could be completed in 260 working days. This would involve 208,000 man-hours and labor at \$1.15 per hour would be \$239,200. Other costs (boats, equipment, and so forth) are estimated at \$60,000.

Such a project would be beneficial to the public, the Army, and, of course, to those needing work.

2. Planting shelterbelts: There are many areas on the reservations and off where shelterbelts would be desirable. Since I have no definite project in mind, I make no estimated cost of work which would be provided.

3. Reforestation: Reforestation projects could be carried on both at Turtle Mountain and at Fort Berthold. At Turtle Mountain some thought has been given to the idea of clearing 10 square miles of the scrub brush and reseed the area with pine. The pine could be sold for Christmas trees, thus providing income for the tribe and labor for members. The Turtle Mountain project would involve 928,000 man-hours and cost slightly over a million dollars for labor. There would be in addition to this a cost of about 3 cents per tree. About 2000 trees per acre would be required. The cost for trees would be about \$38,400.00 or \$384,000 for 10 square miles. Total costs approximately \$1,384,000. Perhaps these projects are far in excess of the costs contemplated under the act and if so could be cut down accordingly. The Turtle Mountain area, however, is one where there is much unemployment and there some project under this bill should be undertaken.

The reforestation (or forestation) project at Fort Berthold would be on a much smaller basis. It is estimated that a successful project could be carried on in 52,000 man-hours at a cost of \$60,000.

4. Development of recreation areas on lake: Such a project would include the landscaping, cleaning, building entrance roadways, building restrooms and otherwise developing picnic areas along the lake for the benefit of local people and tourists. Such a project could be as large or small as is feasible. But to give some figures, such a project could be carried on with 50 men for 1 year involving 104,000 man-hours at a cost of \$121,600 for labor.

5. Lake development at Turtle Mountain: It has been proposed that there could be five dams and gateways built to build up and connect the lakes on the Turtle Mountain Reservation. It is my thought that such a project could be carried on for a cost similar to the project listed above (4).

6. Summer youth camp at Fort Yates: This has been proposed as a camp for carrying on youth programs for Indians in the Aberdeen area. It would include 10 cabins, a mess hall, toilets, etc., and the estimated cost is \$75,000.

7. Swimming pool at Fort Yates: A swimming pool has been proposed and it is estimated that the cost would be approximately \$75,000.

8. Clearing land on proposed dam in the Walhalla area: If it is determined that a dam is to be constructed the brush and trees should be cleared using the laborers in the area. The area, I understand, is approximately 15 miles long and 1 mile wide. Estimated cost would be somewhat less than the proposed clearing of the 10 square miles at Turtle Mountains.

The above are only estimates made by one not qualified, but since the telegram indicated that estimates were wanted these are submitted for consideration. You may want to revise the estimates. It may be advisable to check with the Army Engineers at Riverdale on the cost of the project of removing driftwood from the Garrison Reservoir.

Sincerely,

HANS WALKER, Jr.

NASHVILLE, TENN., May 19, 1962.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Washington, D.C.:

In Governor Ellington's absence from the city, I am taking the liberty of replying to your telegram of May 16. The Governor has previously made a statement in support of

legislation favoring the public works program and preliminary information from Tennessee reveals that the State has approximately \$45 million in projects which could be constructed providing approximately 13 million man-hours. I hope this information will be helpful.

HARLAN MATHEWS,
Commissioner, State of Tennessee, Finance and Administration.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond, Va., May 18, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In response to your telegraphed request I am enclosing a list of urgently needed water supply and sewage treatment facilities in areas of Virginia which have been declared eligible for aid under the Area Development Act.

This is a hastily assembled list and its submission, of course, does not constitute endorsement of the proposed emergency public works legislation.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT S. HARRISON, Jr.,
Governor.

Public sewage treatment projects needed in areas eligible for aid under Area Redevelopment Act¹

Place	County	Estimated cost	Grant requested under Public Law 87-88
Appalachia.....	Wise.....	\$244,000	-----
Arno.....	do.....	61,000	-----
Big Stone Gap ²	do.....	287,000	\$150,000
Cleveland.....	Russell.....	89,000	-----
Clintwood ²	Dickenson.....	147,000	68,700
Coeburn ²	Wise.....	198,000	35,010
Derby.....	do.....	54,000	-----
Deel.....	Buchanan.....	89,000	-----
Dorchester.....	Wise.....	134,000	-----
East Stone Gap.....	do.....	134,000	-----
Gate City ²	Scott.....	198,000	98,162
Grundy.....	Buchanan.....	198,000	-----
Honaker.....	Russell.....	89,000	-----
Hurley.....	Buchanan.....	37,000	-----
Independence ²	Grayson.....	89,000	119,400
Jonesville.....	Lee.....	89,000	-----
Norton ²	Wise.....	328,000	163,800
Pennington Gap ²	Lee.....	147,000	57,065
Scottsville.....	Fluvanna.....	(7)	16,767
Weber City ²	Scott.....	(7)	93,811
Wise ²	Wise.....	(7)	53,010
Total.....		2,612,000	-----

¹ The costs listed above are for sewage treatment facilities only. In most of these communities additional expenditures are needed for construction of sewage collection systems.

² Requests for grants under Public Law 87-88 (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) have been filed from these localities with the State water control board in the amounts listed.

MAY 18, 1962.

WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENTS URGENTLY NEEDED FOR MUNICIPALLY OWNED SYSTEMS IN FOLLOWING COUNTIES

Buchanan County, town of Grundy: Additional source, treatment, distribution mains, and storage.

Carroll County, Galax: Town already has under construction project to bring system up to needs.

Dickenson County, Clintwood: New source of supply, pumping stations, force main, modernization of filter plant, distribution mains, and storage.

Grayson County, Independence: Additional source, distribution mains, and storage.

Lee County:

Jonesville: Additional source, treatment, pump station, force main, distribution mains, and storage, \$150,000.

Pennington Gap: New source, purification plant, force main, distribution mains, and storage, \$434,000.

Russell County:

Honaker: Distribution mains and storage.

Lebanon: Additional source, treatment, mains, and storage.

Cleveland: New source, purification plant, mains, and storage.

Scott County:

Dungannon: Additional source, treatment, force main, and pump station, mains, and storage.

Gate City: Additional mains and storage.

Nickelsville: Additional source, treatment, mains, and storage.

Weber City Sanitation District: Addition to filter plant, additional mains, and storage.

Wise County (\$388,000):

Big Stone Gap: New filter plant, additional mains, and storage.

Coeburn: New source, filter plant, pump station, force main, distribution mains, and storage, \$452,812; alternate, \$283,820.

Norton: Enlargement of filter plant, distribution mains, and storage.

Pound: Additional source, treatment, transmission main, distribution mains, and storage.

St. Paul: New filtration plant, distribution mains, and storage, \$250,000.

Wise: New source, filtration plant, force main, distribution mains, and storage.

Cumberland County and Fluvanna County: No municipal or county owned water supplies in these counties.

(NOTE.—Where cost figures are given, these were taken from consulting engineers' preliminary report and estimate.)

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I believe is now generally understood by Members of the Senate, later today there will be submitted a request for unanimous consent that voting on the amendments to the bill shall begin, following reasonable debate, on Thursday, in the expectation that the Senate can conclude its action on the bill on Friday. Certainly that will be a satisfactory schedule, insofar as I am concerned.

When we have finalized that proposed agreement, and when the attention of the Senate is immediately directed to the amendment now at the desk, I expect to discuss with greater emphasis and greater elaboration than I shall now the reasons why I believe the Ellender amendment should be rejected.

But at this time, before we come to discuss the particulars of the amendment, I wish the RECORD to show that I believe that, on the whole, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry did a very constructive piece of work, this year, in its handling of the so-called Kennedy-Freeman farm bill. It came to us with a determined effort on the part of the administration to extract from the farmers and from Congress the authority and the power of self-determination, and to delegate to the Department of Agriculture the control of agriculture. To me, that would be manifestly unwise. To me, it would be unwise, in the first place, because I believe the job of the Department of Agriculture has already become so colossal and its responsibilities already have become so great that failures and cracks in the structure are becoming apparent to all Americans—so much so, that even if we take the very kindest attitude toward what is wrong, toward developments which have led to instances such as the Estes scandal, for example, the kindest comment which could be made would be that the octopus of the Department of Agriculture has become so large that it is impossible for men who have good intentions to properly police and control and operate the Department prudently, honestly, and wisely.

Because, Mr. President, I like human beings generally, I dare hope that when our investigation is concluded, we shall arrive at that conclusion. However, the conclusion actually to be reached may

be altogether different. Moreover, Senators may be sure that the McClellan committee will follow the facts, regardless of where they may lead; and if, instead of the reasons I have attributed for this collapse of administration, it develops that there are other reasons, much less savory and much more undesirable, certainly our committee will expose them, and the public will learn of them, and the necessary corrective steps will be taken.

At any rate, Mr. President, I doubt that anyone will deny that a prodigious job has been assigned to the Department of Agriculture, from the standpoint of the authority it is now attempting to exercise, in the area of farm legislation; and if we were to add to those great burdens and problems the power and the controls and the decisions originally called for by the Kennedy-Freeman bill—which I presume was written by Dr. Cochrane, although at least we have to attribute it to those who have presented it and who have approved it—we would be expanding the authority of the Department of Agriculture so greatly that the cases—including that of Billie Sol Estes—which now are attracting the attention of the country would be increased immeasurably.

Mr. President, we must take steps to see to it that the people working on the farms will receive a fair price for a full crop; and we must solve the surplus problems to such an extent that they will not be burdens on the market and will not cause the commodities to sell for less than a parity price.

So, Mr. President, although I must disagree, as regards some features of the bill and the amendments, with the distinguished chairman of the committee, nevertheless I believe that, in the main, the committee did a constructive job in proceeding to remove from the bill most of the provisions which would have provided additional amounts of authority and power for the bureaucrats and additional areas in which determinations would be made by the bureaucrats, instead of by those who are actively engaged in the farming business.

I think it is good to know that, while title 1, in my opinion, still has some deficiencies, we have improved it tremendously. As I recall, we improved it with the support of the chairman. I am not sure. I am not trying to say we did it or not with his approval. But we improved it, because we took away the requested right of the Department of Agriculture, if you please, to dispossess any or every farmer in America from the land he owns and tell him he has to move off, and sell out, at a price to be determined by a board of arbitration, whether he desires to continue to be a land-owning farmer or not. That provision has been eliminated from the bill.

We are talking about a farm problem we have had before us for a long time, and I think we have made some progress in the direction of solving it.

I fail to see the validity in the argument of the Department of Agriculture which now seeks to disclaim the program which it supported just a year ago. When it supported the feed grains program, it made a lot of attractive pre-

dictions as to what would occur. They did not all occur to the extent the prophets indicated, but some progress was made in reducing surpluses in this country, without reducing the prices and income received by the farmers.

I notice the Wall Street Journal for today, for example, points out that the storage of grains must be down to less than 1 billion bushels, because it states that we had 1,800 million bushels in storage in 1960 and that over 800 million bushels were sold since October 1, 1961.

That is progress. That is moving in the right direction. It is moving in the right direction without giving bureaucrats the right to whiplash every farmer to be in compliance with a bureaucratic order.

If we were to adopt the amendment, which I feel sure the chairman of the committee is disposed to introduce and support, for a compulsory feed grains program that will take away the latitude and freedom on the part of the farmers, it would put the bureaucrats in Washington in control. I hope we reject that proposal. When it comes time to offer it, I shall discuss the amendment in specific detail at that time.

May I point out also that, according to the Department of Agriculture publication of April 30, the sign-up for the feed grains program to divert over 29 million acres from corn and grain sorghums has been completed. This exceeds by about 3 million acres the 26 million acres-plus which were voluntarily signed into retirement a year ago.

That is also progress.

Also, we are told, 6½ million acres of sorghums have been diverted, and 3½ million acres of barley production have been diverted.

Our committee, which reported the bill, proposes to continue and improve the programs which are beginning to operate, and to resist any attempt to displace them and substitute for them a complete program of controls and directives from the Department of Agriculture, under a compulsory piece of legislation.

With regard to corn, I hold in my hand the commodity page of today's issue of the Wall Street Journal, which points out that—

Buying of corn was sparked by the reduced volume of corn held by the Government, lighter receipts, and a strong cash market. In the week ended May 11 the Government sold 12,786,000 bushels of corn for domestic use and export. This brought total Government sales of corn for the season that started October 1, 1961, to 818,726,000 bushels, up from 184,788,000 bushels in the like period a year ago. In recent weeks sales of corn by the Government have exceeded 20 million bushels weekly.

This is also progress in the direction of decreasing the problem of surpluses. This is also progress in the direction of coming to a long-term solution of the farm problem. It, too, was done without any compulsion, without any coercion, without forcing the farmers of America to abandon their freedom and to delegate their fate to the decisions, good, bad, or indifferent, of men either honest or corrupt, efficient or inefficient, in the Department of Agriculture.

The corn glut—

Says the same issue of the Wall Street Journal, on page 1—

held by Uncle Sam shrinks fast. The price-support pile of corn owned by the Government fell to 729 million bushels May 1, down 138 million bushels from a month earlier and far below the 1.4 billion held a year before.

I would think that normally an administration that had supported a program which is beginning to operate and which is beginning to reduce surpluses, and which has not seriously, let me say, cut back farm income, and which has retained the freedom of the individual farmer, would come to Congress with some minor suggestions for correction, some lessons from experience, and would say, "Let us continue the program, which is beginning to work."

It is very hard for me to understand the motive of a Secretary of Agriculture, or of a President, or of a professor from the University of Minnesota, whose idea this is, that this program, which is really just getting tried in its first year, should be abandoned in favor of a program yet to be prescribed and yet to be defined, tucked away in the mind of some bureaucrat, which would tell the feed grain farmers, "You have got to do what we say you must do."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is aware, is he not, that when the emergency program for feed grains was put on the statute books, it was done to give us time to write a permanent program? The Senator remembers that, does he not?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I think the original act, passed in 1938, was enacted in order to give us time to write a permanent program. We have been trying to write one ever since.

Mr. ELLENDER. The program which the Senator is criticizing was an emergency program for 1 year, in order to give us time to present a permanent program.

Mr. MUNDT. May I correct the Senator? He said I was criticizing the program. I said it was beginning to work. I was not criticizing the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator was criticizing the administration.

Mr. MUNDT. For wanting to change it.

Mr. ELLENDER. For wanting to change it. We have had it in operation for 2 years, instead of 1, at tremendous cost. The program will cost the Government, as I pointed out yesterday, over \$900 million this year. It strikes me that this is an extravagant program, and a permanent program of this kind is not what I would want to see.

Mr. MUNDT. The chairman of the committee does something which is not really compatible with his normal behavior, because he is a great advocate of human freedom—and I respect him for it—and he wants to give the people the right to vote to solve their problem—and I respect him for that—and he believes in protecting the right of the States—and I respect him for that. So I think

he wears uncomfortably this new cap which he now has when he introduces a program to knock out my wheat proposal, which simply says, "Let us give the wheat farmers the right to vote, at long last, between two attractive programs for handling the wheat problem."

I do not know how the farmers are going to vote. I must say in my own State of South Dakota, which is a great wheat State, I get a great confusion of counsel from producers of wheat. I get some wheat farmers who are not dedicated to the proposal that we should continue the present proposal for a year or two longer to determine whether the progress being made under it will continue.

There is another group of fine wheat producers dedicated to the so-called wheat certificate program, the two-price proposal, which is the proposal advocated by the Department. These men are equally honest. They are equally desirous of solving the wheat problem.

It seems to me logical, sensible, and profoundly American to follow the guidance provided by the committee bill, which would say to the farmers in South Dakota and elsewhere all across the length and breadth of America, "You are the people who are most vitally interested in this problem. You are the people whose future and fortune will depend upon success in the agricultural business and in the production of wheat. Here are two proposals, each with commendable advocates. We shall give you an opportunity in a national referendum, in good American style, to vote in an honest and fair election, in which the voting will be carefully conducted and the votes carefully counted to determine which of the two programs you wish to follow."

In a second referendum, perhaps a week or two or even 3 weeks later, the same wheat farmers will be given an opportunity to determine whether the farm program on wheat selected by a majority of the wheat producers voting in this country should then become the law of the land.

I can see no valid reason whatsoever for denying to the wheat farmer a right to vote on the program which is going to determine his future and his fate. That is what the Ellender amendment would do, in reality. It would knock out the option. It would knock out the choice. It would disfranchise the wheat farmer as a voter in America on one of the most important economic problems confronting the farmers. It is as simple as that.

I am sure my good friend will not deny that. He would couch it in prettier words, but the result will be, if we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect, that the Senate will vote on Thursday on that simple issue when we vote on the Ellender amendment.

Our committee does not know whether the wheat certificate program will work or not. A couple of years ago, my good friend who is the chairman will recall, we voted that provision in. Then there was a sort of second thought, we got some different counsel, and we voted the

provision out. We never did get it to the Senate at that time.

The wheat proposal of the administration has a lot of support. The wheat certificate program is the so-called two-price system. It has antecedents which go back as far as the McNary-Haugen bill. Its history goes back to the early 1920's. There have always been farmers in America who have felt, "This is the answer."

I do not know whether it is the answer or not. I am persuaded by the arguments. I am perfectly willing to give it a trial, provided the farmers of America wish to try it. However, I see no reason why we should tell the farmers of America, all at once in 1962, "This is the program you must have."

The committee bill now contains my amendment which says: "Let us give the farmers an opportunity to vote. Let us find out what the fellow whose life, fortune, and family depend upon a proper decision, has to say as a result of his right to vote and to make a decision."

I see nothing wrong with that. That is compatible with all farm legislation which, in the final analysis, gives to the farmer an opportunity to choose between a given program and another program.

The only thing which is novel about the Mundt proposal is that it would give to the farmers of America who are raising wheat an opportunity to choose between two programs; each of which has its own attractive features, each of which has its own body of supporters, each of which has its own economic figures, statistics, facts, and predictions with which to bolster its arguments.

I should like to find out which program the farmers favor. I do not think the Senate is so wise that very many Senators will wish to go to the farmers in their own States and say, "Look, Chum, a fellow from South Dakota wanted to give you an opportunity to vote on which of these programs you wanted, but I knew that you were so dumb that you would not vote intelligently, so I decided what was good for you."

That is what Senators will have to tell their constituents, if they vote for the Ellender amendment. They will find a more senatorial manner in which to tell them. The language will be a little happier than that language, but the fact is that is what the farmers will know the Senators are telling them, because Senators are being asked to deny to the farmers of America a right to vote and to state their opinions on the program.

Those who will support the committee language will say, "We have confidence in the American farmer." Those who will vote for the Ellender proposal to strike out the option will say, "We do not have any confidence in the American farmers. We know more than they do. We will tell them what they have to do."

I submit that is not only bad legislation but also a bad approach to any problem under a democratic system such as ours.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the wheat farmers of the Nation are very much in

favor of their present program. They have a bonanza, as it were.

Mr. MUNDT. It is not a bonanza. The wheat farmers are not getting parity.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a minimum acreage, under the law, of 55 million acres, and the Secretary of Agriculture cannot do anything about it. He is powerless to act. When that minimum acreage was put into the law production per acre was 13.3 bushels per acre. Now production is 26.2 bushels per acre. And the minimum acreage is still in the law. Of course, the farmers will vote for that.

Mr. MUNDT. Well, if the farmers will vote for that, then the Senator is not supporting a very popular program.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I am seeking to do is to enact a permanent program which will do justice to the wheat farmers but which will not do violence to the farm program as a whole. It is my considered judgment that if the program continues to cost the taxpayers as much as it cost last year for wheat, corn, and other feed grains and for dairy products—in excess of \$2 billion—all farm programs may well be repealed. There is no doubt about that in my mind.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator saying that he proposes to impose upon the wheat farmers of America a program they do not want?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. MUNDT. It sounds that way. The Senator said the farmers would not vote for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. They can vote for the program. We have provided that they may vote it up or down.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; but what will happen if the farmers vote it down? "Down" is the proper term. Down is where their prices would assuredly go.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the farmers will not get price supports in excess of 50 percent of parity.

Mr. MUNDT. If they vote it down, then down, down, down will go the price of wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. They will not get price supports in excess of 50 percent of parity.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct; they will not get realistic price supports. It really will be a voting down all right.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me, Mr. President, that a farmer who expects his government to support the price of a commodity should also be willing to trim down the acreage so that production will be in line and in keeping with what the country needs. No man on the Senate floor knows better than the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that the American farmers have been producing, for the past 5 or 6 or 7 years, more wheat than the country needs. The same thing is true with respect to corn and the other feed grains.

As I said yesterday, it strikes me as almost immoral for the corn farmers of this country to expect price supports and yet not be willing to curtail acreage so that production would be in keeping with the requirements of the country. That is what I am seeking to accomplish.

Let the farmers select whether they wish to have fair price supports or low price supports. If they desire to have

price supports, then let them cut their acreage down so that production will be in keeping with requirements. Certainly that is something which ought to be done. I see nothing wrong with it.

Mr. MUNDT. It is very true that the farmer will get a second vote either way, after he has selected which of the two programs he prefers.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. He could vote to extend the present program for another 2 years, which I presume he would do under those circumstances. If the farmers select in the first referendum the wheat certificate plan, the farmers could vote for the trial with that. I suspect they would have to do so, because, as the Senator has pointed out, the alternative is, "Take the wheat certificate program as submitted by the administration or you will get nothing. Vote 'yes' or starve. Vote 'yes' or go broke. Vote 'yes' or go out of business."

That is not the kind of voting we prefer in this country. We believe in giving a man a valid choice between two attractive propositions. We do not believe in the kind of voting which is conducted in Communist countries, where a person votes "da" or goes to jail, or the kind of voting under a Hitler government, where a person votes "ja" or goes to jail.

We do not believe in giving a man a choice which is a choice in name but not in fact, a choice between taking what he is offered or going broke. That would be the alternative presented, if the Senate were to adopt the Ellender amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The farmer would have a choice to obtain price supports by voting for the program we have incorporated in the bill. What is that choice?

The production of at least 1 billion bushels of wheat. The acreage to produce that amount—or a little in excess of what is needed—would be distributed among farmers according to what they had planted in the past.

Mr. MUNDT. Without price supports.

Mr. ELLENDER. They would receive price supports, of course. That is the point. The alternative program that they would vote upon, if the provisions of the Mundt amendment were rejected, would not only give the farmers the choice of voting for a program in which they would be permitted to produce 1 billion bushels of wheat or more and obtain price supports, but also on diverted acres they would be paid up to 50 percent of what they would produce if they were permitted to plant the acreage. What is wrong with that?

Mr. MUNDT. If the Mundt amendment were eliminated, as suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, the farmer would be given a choice of voting for the wheat certificate plan or a plan without price supports under which he would have no alternative protective device. My amendment would provide a choice of voting for the wheat certificate plan or a continuation of the present program.

The program is not some nefarious Republican program. It is a choice be-

tween the administration's latest idea and the administration's idea of a year ago. It would continue the present program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as the Senator pointed out a while ago, if the farmers voted for the wheat certificate program, they would then have to vote again as to whether or not they wanted to live under that program.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. They certainly would have the right to vote for the program to obtain price supports. In my judgment, because they would be paid on diverted acres, their income would certainly not be disturbed for at least 3 years.

Mr. MUNDT. What the Senator has said is partially true. If the Mundt amendment is eliminated, farmers will be given the choice of voting for the wheat certificate program and production without price supports. They would have an opportunity to vote as to whether they wanted to live under the wheat certificate program. The other half of the story is that they could live under the wheat certificate program or die under a jungle dilemma of economics in which they would receive no price supports whatever, and would be confronted with already large surpluses of wheat, which would constantly depress the price of wheat in the market place.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Mundt plan, which is an extension of the 2-year emergency program, were adopted and the old program were reinstated after 2 years, farmers could vote themselves out of that program. But the Senator from South Dakota knows that they would not.

Mr. MUNDT. No; they would not.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course they would not, because the program has proved to be a bonanza. Every year farmers have been permitted to produce hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat which we do not need. Yet, Uncle Sam has been supporting this excessive production. I do not want that to continue.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit that no program is a bonanza which continues to compel the wheat farmer to sell his product below parity. Even parity would not be a bonanza. Parity is equity. Parity is justice. Parity would give the wheat farmer the same kind of equitable treatment that we try to give the rice farmer, the cotton farmer, the tobacco farmer, and any other farmer who is getting along all right. It is not a bonanza.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator well knows that 3 years ago Congress enacted programs affecting the cotton and rice industries in the same manner that we are trying to apply to wheat. At one time the production of cotton was far in excess of our requirements. What did the farmers do? They voted to limit acreage so that production would be in keeping with our requirements.

The same thing occurred with respect to the tobacco industry. I see the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is in the Chamber. The tobacco growers have curtailed acreage planted in tobacco in keeping with the production that is necessary.

The same statement applies to those engaged in the rice industry. But that is not the case with wheat. As I have said, wheat growers have been especially privileged in that the Secretary of Agriculture is powerless to reduce the national allotment below 55 million acres. He cannot act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee can well anticipate what I shall say in rejoinder to his statement, because he has heard me make the statement many times in the committee. He knows that the wheat farmer confronts an altogether different situation from the one that confronts the cotton farmer. The cotton farmer is a happy individual who lives in a salubrious climate in which all his competitors enjoy the same kind of climatic conditions in the same general area of the country. When the cotton farmers vote to reduce their cotton acreage, they are pretty well satisfied that no one in North Dakota, South Dakota, or Nebraska will move in and start to raise cotton. So they have been able to devise for themselves, and have supported, a cotton program which is working pretty well. I am ready to vote to help to make it work even better. I shall follow the guidance of those in the cotton area in that connection. The program has worked pretty well in the cotton industry because the problem is unique.

How about the wheat farmer? When the wheat farmer does not raise wheat and starts cutting back, what happens? Farmers in Louisiana, Arkansas, and other States start raising it. Wheat can be raised almost anywhere, and farmers have been doing it. The production of wheat in our country which is no longer being raised on the rich black soil of South Dakota, North Dakota, and elsewhere, is migrating into other areas. It is being raised on acreage that has been idle from the normal production of other crops. In addition, there are small wheat plats all over the country that are not affected at all.

The situation has been captured in the statement that "one man's medicine can be another man's poison." We cannot take a formula that has worked well for cotton—and I am glad it has—and say that it will also work for wheat and corn. We are dealing with crops which are national in character, and which can be raised across the length and breadth of our country. As a consequence, we must deal with it in a different type of legislation. It would be easy to solve the farm problem if we could make the formula which has worked for rice or tobacco work equally well for all other farm products. Unhappily, we must abide by the controls of nature. Unhappily we must abide by the geographic facts of the earth. So we must deal with the problem separately.

I do not wish to discuss the point in detail today, but just prior to the voting

stage I wish to reaffirm the fact that the Senate will be voting, in a yea-and-nay vote, upon a simple question which can be stated as follows: "Are you sure, Mr. Senator, that you are so much wiser than the farmers on the farms of your State that you want to deny them the right of free choice and monopolize it for yourself? If you are, vote against the Mundt committee amendment. Vote for the Ellender amendment. But be mighty sure that you can convince your farmer constituents that their stupidity is as great as you assume it is, and that they attribute to you the mental capacities which you assume you have."

I am merely saying that at long last we should give the farmer himself an opportunity to vote. Let us quit trying to push programs down his throat. Let us stop trying to pretend that we are wiser than we are. Let us give farmers an opportunity to decide which of the two programs they prefer. After they decide that, let them determine whether to accept or reject the program. Let us, in short, vote against the pending Ellender amendment.

I yield the floor.

PRESENT VOLUNTARY FEED GRAINS SURPLUS REDUCTION PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXTENDED AND STRENGTHENED, NOT ABANDONED

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the pending farm bill, S. 3225, as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee, provides for a 1-year extension of the successful feed grains program that has been in operation during the past year. This program is voluntary. It has reduced the surplus and cut costs to the Government. It has increased farm income. It is popular with farmers. It should not be abandoned now, at a time when surplus stocks are still high as a result of the costly price support—no control law of the Benson period. Especially it should not be abandoned in favor of the mandatory program now backed by the Department of Agriculture, in view of the near certainty that if such a program is enacted by Congress, it will not receive the requisite approval by two-thirds of feed grains producers nationally voting in the required referendum.

I have analyzed the specific reasons why the referendum will not carry in my statements of April 17, May 17, and May 21, and in my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture of May 11, all of which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I urge Senators with a serious interest in the welfare of our Nation's farmers to read these statements and judge for themselves whether in fact it is not a near certainty that a vote for the mandatory feed grain program now being offered with the backing of the administration is not a vote against any reasonable farm programs at all.

It is both cynical and misleading to say "If farmers do not vote for quotas, they should not have price supports," without at the same time carefully analyzing which farmers are voting, and whose price supports are involved.

TWO-THIRDS OF THOSE VOTING DO NOT MARKET FEED GRAINS

Such analysis will show that some two-thirds of the feed grains producers

specifically eligible to vote in the referendum do not sell feed grains for cash, but feed all their crop to livestock and dairy cows on their own farms. Far from being sellers of grain for cash, and thus amenable to the discipline of the marketplace, this two-thirds of feed grain producers are buyers of grain. It is very hard for them to understand why they should vote for a program which, first, limits and reduces the acreage of feed grains they can grow; second, raises the dollar cost of the feed they have to buy; and third, offers no guarantee of higher prices on the livestock or milk or other farm commodity that they sell.

Milk producers in particular will have no reason whatsoever to support such a program.

Mr. President, I am very conscious of this feeling, because I have talked literally to hundreds of dairy farmers in my State about this problem.

NO INCENTIVE FOR DAIRY PRODUCERS TO FAVOR MANDATORY FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The price of milk in the areas of heavy production is set by the support level. A mandatory feed grain program as proposed will not raise that level. But it will raise the price of feed, and so will raise costs to dairy farmers, who already are among the most hard pressed of the Nation's agricultural producers.

Even if a dairy income improvement program, such as I have offered, with the cosponsorship of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], our able majority whip, is adopted—and I intend to press hard for this—dairy farmers will have little reason to vote for a program that raises their costs. If a mandatory feed grains program is enacted, then my dairy income improvement program becomes a must. Otherwise dairy farmers will be chained to 75 percent of parity milk, which is \$2.85 per hundredweight of 3.5 percent butterfat, with the prospect of a sharp acreage cut and a rise in the price of the feed they buy. But it must be recognized that whether a dairy program is enacted or not, it will be difficult to convince dairy producers who do not sell grain that it is in their monetary interest to vote for the mandatory program of marketing allotments on feed grains.

Mr. President, just imagine a typical dairy farmer in Wisconsin who may have, perhaps, 50 acres of corn and feed grain on his farm and, as is done by virtually every other feed grain producer in my State, he feeds it all to his cows. If this provision goes into effect, it means that he will be mandated, ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture, if it carries in the referendum, to cut back his production from 50 acres to 40 acres. Therefore he will either have to reduce his production of milk or he will have to go out into the market and buy feed grain.

There is no possibility that if he votes in favor of this proposal the milk price will be higher. It will not be higher. It will \$3.11, or \$2.85 for 3.5-test milk. Under these circumstances it is perfectly predictable what the farmer is going to do. We know that many farmers will sit down with pencil and paper before they

vote on this proposal and figure out, "Do I gain or do I lose?"

Any dairy farmer who does this is bound to come to the conclusion that he will lose. He will therefore vote "No." The fact is that a very large number of farmers who will vote in this referendum will be dairy farmers. A very large number of the farmers will be dairy farmers who do not sell a nickel's worth or a bushel of feed grain. These farmers predictably will vote "No."

Incidentally, I have talked with officials in the Department of Agriculture about this, to independent experts, and to the staff of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and they all say this line of reasoning is correct.

I challenge any Senator and I challenge the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to give me any reason why a dairy farmer should not vote "No" under those circumstances.

Oh, there may be a broad-scale view of the whole farm program that may make a farmer consider the welfare of the corn farmer of Iowa, and so forth, and under those circumstances he may in good conscience feel that a wise vote is to cut the production of feed grain on his own farm by 20 percent, and substantially increase his costs.

However, I do not believe there is any genuine reason, no definite, no specific reason for such farmers to vote "Yes." They will vote "No."

HOG, CATTLE PRODUCERS OPPOSE MANDATORY PROGRAM

Hog, beef, and other livestock producers also feel they have no reason to vote for a program that raises their costs with no sure prospect of an increase in the commodity prices of what they market. To be sure, the careful studies of the Department of Agriculture and many other experts at land-grant colleges and elsewhere have demonstrated the relation between feed prices and beef and hog prices. Cheap feed means cheap hogs and cheap cattle, and farm income plummets. But it must be recognized that these analyses are not universally accepted. There is a very widespread feeling among livestock producers that their prices and marketings and income have been satisfactory because of the absence of any Government programs for what they sell. In this conviction they have the staunch support of many farm organization officials as well as farm newspapers and periodicals.

In addition, as I have explained previously, in my statements on May 17 and April 17, feed grain producers who also raise tobacco or cotton, and who receive a substantial cash income from these crops, have little interest in a marketing quota program which will restrict the amount of feed grains they can plant. It is the opinion of a distinguished agricultural economist from a Southern State that producers in his area would never favor a marketing quota plan for feed grains, no matter how often it was offered, or how low feed prices fell. Increasing education and understanding would not help, since these producers will continue to feel that allowing expansion of their feed grains production is very

much in their interest. So it is not unlikely that southern feed producers would oppose a mandatory feed grain program by an even greater vote the second time around than the first. This would be especially true if the payments proposed are lowered after the first year.

Granted a bandwagon psychological effect might raise the level of approval the first time around. But as I have shown, it is extremely doubtful that this would be enough to offset the deeply ingrained opposition of many, many farmers in many parts of the country to a mandatory supply management program for feed grains, an opposition in which they will be encouraged by many farm organizations and local farm leaders. What is more, there will have been no experience of a free market in feed grains to prove the correctness of the studies showing what will happen to farm prices and income if supply adjustment and price support programs are abandoned.

PROGRAM LIKELY TO MEAN END OF PRICE SUPPORTS

It is one thing to say that price supports without production limitations cannot be justified.

But it is quite a different thing to offer a mandatory supply limitation program on which hundreds of thousands of farmers with sharply differing, and even conflicting, interests will have to vote—and using this as a justification for abandoning the price supports that are the only guarantee of reasonable prices and incomes for the main feed grain producers, price supports which in a situation of great surplus provide the only sound basis for stability in agriculture.

So let it be very clear that a vote in the Senate for a mandatory feed grain program will be a vote against any price supports for feed grains. It will be a vote for an abandonment of price supports on by far the largest crop in the Nation. It will be a vote that, to be sure, will result in a sharp reduction of Government costs, but at a fantastic price—and the price must be recognized.

Mr. President, abruptly ending the feed grain price supports in a period of substantial surplus will mean a certain, great overproduction of feed, and a predictable drop in the price of corn to 75 cents a bushel. It will mean distress beef prices, 9-cent hogs, and a greater-than-ever dairy surplus. It will mean a serious drop in agricultural income at a time when farm income already is far, far lower than in any other sector of our generally prosperous economy.

The predictable costs of picking up the pieces after the Nation's farmers are in such a situation will be very high, higher, indeed, by far than the cost of continuing the present successful feed grains program. It will mean high costs in welfare payments and in the redevelopment of rural areas where incomes will be sharply reduced.

PRESENT PROGRAM CAN BE IMPROVED, EXTENDED

With modifications that I have suggested, the present feed grains program, backed by the administration last year, can be made to work even better. Its real costs are already substantially lower

than the bookkeeping costs, since most of the payments in kind represent grain that otherwise would be used in surplus disposal programs which bring no dollar returns.

I feel strongly that there should be modifications which will require a greater degree of cooperation and that can sharply reduce the cost of the program, although we know that the program is sure to cost less, because we are very unlikely to get the kind of excellent weather we had last year—the best weather in many years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table spelling out in detail the cost of the present program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1961 feed grain program results	
Acreage diverted under the program:	
Corn.....millions of acres.....	19.1
Sorghum grain.....do.....	6.1
Total.....do.....	25.2
Estimated cost of program payments:	
Corn.....millions of dollars.....	645.0
Sorghum grain.....do.....	137.0
Administrative costs.....do.....	42.8
Total.....do.....	824.8
Cost per acre.....dollars.....	31
DEPARTMENT'S ESTIMATED SAVINGS RESULTING FROM 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM	
Total savings (millions of dollars)	
Element of cost:	
1. Acquisition costs avoided.....	353
2. Carrying costs avoided.....	843
3. Interest savings.....	211
Total.....	1,407
Cost of program:	
1. Land retirement payments.....	782
2. Administration costs.....	42
Total.....	824
Net savings to Government.....	583
DEPARTMENT'S ESTIMATE OF EFFECT ON FARM INCOME	
1961: Value of production of all feed grains, basis price per ton of corn.....	
of corn.....	5,372
Payments for land diversion.....	782
Total.....	6,154
1960: Value of production of all feed grains, basis price per ton of corn.....	
of corn.....	5,705
Increase in gross returns.....	449

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is a program which will work. It is a practical program. It has been tried.

Mr. President, specifically to strengthen the program, I offer an amendment to encourage cross-compliance under the voluntary feed grain program as provided in the farm bill, S. 3225. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

(The amendment is as follows:)

On page 17, between lines 15 and 16, strike out the quotation marks and insert the following:

"(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may require producers of corn, grain sorghums, or barley, as a condition of eligibility for any benefit under this or any other law administered by the Secretary, to participate in the special agricultural conservation program under this subsection to the extent prescribed by him (except that a producer of Malting barley, or a producer of barley on a summer fallow farm, as described in section 105(c)(6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall not be so required to participate in the special agricultural conservation program for barley)."

Mr. PROXMIRE. My amendment provides that as a condition of eligibility for other farm programs that provide financial benefits to producers, the Secretary may require participation in the diversion feature of the voluntary feed grains program—with the obvious qualification that the farmer be a producer of feed grains.

This is based on a simple and easily understood principle, one which I know from my own experience most farmers accept and, indeed, strongly approve.

That is, farmers who choose not to comply with a voluntary production reduction program should not be permitted to benefit from other Federal assistance or subsidy programs of other types.

This adds a sensible, easily understood incentive to back up the generous inducement offered farmers already to gain compliance with the feed grain program. Those farmers who want the freedom to continue to plant all they want could continue to do so, but they could not at the same time continue to receive lucrative subsidies of various kinds also offered by the Department of Agriculture.

IF MANDATORY FEED GRAIN PROGRAM ADOPTED, SIMULTANEOUS REFERENDUMS SHOULD BE HELD ON WHEAT AND COTTON

Mr. President, I turn now to a different point. One of the reasons why a mandatory feed grain program is likely to lose in a referendum is because there is no provision for simultaneous cross-compliance votes. It is not enough, it seems to me, to propose a mandatory feed grain program without offering a method by which a favorable vote could be achieved. Such a program is likely to be defeated in large measure because, for example, it will be opposed by farmers who vote in a cotton marketing quota program to reduce acreage, but then want to use the additional land to grow feed grains, which they will feed to cattle or hogs. This is not theory; this is what has happened in the past. In order to overcome this possibility, I suggest another approach.

REQUIRE CROSS-COMPLIANCE IN REFERENDUM

It is widely recognized that many producers who vote for marketing quotas on their major money crops may vote against marketing quotas on feed grains. These producers want to use acreage diverted from their major money crop, as well as other acreage, to raise feed grains which form the basis of their livestock program. Therefore, they may be reluctant to support a mandatory mar-

keting quota on feed grains which has the effect of restricting their acreage and raising the price of any feed they have to buy.

In view of the fact that feed grain producers in all parts of the country will be voting in the required referendum, if a marketing quota program for feed grains is enacted, it makes sense to provide for simultaneous referendums for the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs. This is a minimum precaution that should be adopted.

As I have explained in detail, the cards are stacked against two-thirds producer approval of a mandatory feed grain program in any circumstance. At least, requiring simultaneous referenda on the three main marketing quota programs will unstack the deck a bit.

Mr. President, I therefore send to the desk, and ask to have printed, my amendment requiring simultaneous referenda for mandatory marketing programs on cotton, wheat, and feed grains. This is an amendment to the amendment designated "5-21-62—A" which was submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and is supported by the Department of Agriculture. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

(The amendment is as follows:)

On page 13, beginning with the new sentence in line 17, strike out all down through line 4 on page 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever a referendum is conducted pursuant to the provisions of the first paragraph of this section for the purpose of determining whether farmers favor or oppose marketing quotas for feed grains, the Secretary shall at the same time conduct referendums to determine whether farmers favor or oppose marketing quotas for wheat and cotton. The eligibility requirements for voting shall be determined in the case of feed grains by the provisions of the first paragraph of this section, in the case of wheat by the provisions of part III of subtitle B of this title, and in the case of cotton by the provisions of part IV of subtitle B of this title.

"Whenever referendums for feed grains, wheat, and cotton are conducted at the same time as provided herein, any farmer eligible to vote in more than one such referendum shall only be permitted to vote in favor of marketing quotas for all commodities with respect to which he is eligible to vote or against marketing quotas for all commodities with respect to which he is eligible to vote.

"In determining the results of a referendum conducted under this section, the votes cast in favor of or against marketing quotas in the case of feed grains, wheat, and cotton, respectively, shall be counted separately.

"The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within thirty days after the date of such referendum, and if the Secretary determines that more than one-third of the farmers voting in any of the referendums conducted voted against marketing quotas for the commodity concerned, the Secretary shall proclaim that marketing quotas will not be in effect with respect to the crop or crops of that commodity with respect to which the referendum was applicable. If the Secretary determines that, in the case of the feed grain referen-

dum, two-thirds or more of the farmers voting approve marketing quotas for a period of two or three marketing years, no referendum with respect to feed grains shall be held for the subsequent year or years of such period.

"If the Secretary determines that the date prescribed in the first paragraph of this section is too early or too late to conduct simultaneous referendums as provided herein, he may advance or delay the conducting of such referendums by publication of the change of date in the Federal Register."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not favor the enactment of the mandatory feed grains program proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Department of Agriculture. But if such a program is enacted and put to a producer referendum, I feel very strongly that the minimum precaution of simultaneous referendums on wheat and cotton should be provided.

Each producer who grew one or more of these crops would have to vote for or against marketing quotas on all the crops he grew. He could not vote for quotas on one crop and against quotas on the others.

The votes for each crop would then be counted separately. For each crop where two-thirds or more of the producers voting favored supply management, a program would be put into effect. If one-third or more of the producers of any one crop voted "no," no program for that crop would be put into effect.

I sincerely hope my amendment will be adopted.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request to offer, which I think has been cleared by all Senators interested. I will read it at this time, because it may be difficult for the clerk to put it together:

Ordered, That effective at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday, May 24, 1962, debate on the Ellender wheat amendment or any amendment thereto shall proceed until 2 o'clock p.m., to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. ELLENDER and the minority leader; that at said hour a vote shall be taken on said amendment or any amendment, motion, or appeal relating thereto, except a motion to lay on the table; that following a vote on said amendment or amendments, 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled as above, be allotted for debate on the Ellender feed grains amendment or any amendment thereto; on any other amendment, motion, or appeal, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. ELLENDER and the minority leader: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane shall be received.

Ordered, further, That on the question of final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided

and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the minority leader: *Provided*, That the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the minority leader, or either of them, may from the time under their control on the passage of said bill allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator has one error in the request, and that is that the time on an ordinary amendment should be controlled by the movant and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], rather than by the minority leader and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept that suggestion. I thought the minority leader, as a matter of courtesy, would honor such considerations.

I amend my unanimous-consent request accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEARSON in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the Ellender amendments on wheat and feed grains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On the wheat amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. On both the wheat amendment and the feed grain amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the request for the yeas and nays on both amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the majority leader has made any determination as to the time the Senate should convene on Friday. It is of some importance. I heard that the Senate might meet at 10 o'clock on Friday. I understand it is tentatively considered that the Senate will meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like for the Senate to convene at 10 o'clock on Thursday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Could the Senate meet at 10 o'clock on Friday, also?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are one or two Senators who have some commitments late Friday evening.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall ask that the Senate meet at 10 o'clock on Friday morning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood that, with the vote at 2 o'clock on the wheat amendment, it would not be necessary to convene at 10 o'clock on Thursday. I have no objection to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time will be 10 o'clock on Friday morning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And 10 o'clock on Thursday morning?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Ten o'clock on Thursday morning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Ten o'clock on Thursday morning and 10 o'clock on Friday morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; and 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is that agreeable to all?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I shall make the request as soon as action is taken on the pending unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and without objection the order is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday, May 24, 1962, debate on the Ellender wheat amendment or any amendment thereto shall proceed until 2 o'clock p.m., to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by Mr. ELLENDER and the minority leader; that at said hour a vote shall be taken on said amendment or any amendment, motion or appeal relating thereto, except a motion to lay on the table; that following the vote on said amendment or any amendment thereto, 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled as above, shall be allotted for debate on the Ellender feed grain amendment or any amendment thereto; that on any other amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill or the wheat and feed grain amendments shall be in order.

Ordered further, That on the passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal. (May 22, 1962.)

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT ON WEDNESDAY UNTIL 10 A.M. THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tomorrow it stand in adjournment to meet at 10 o'clock on Thursday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT ON THURSDAY UNTIL 10 A.M. FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations Thursday evening it stand in adjournment to meet at 10 o'clock on Friday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FRANK C. BYERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the dean of the Iowa Legislature, the late Senator Frank Byers, of Marion, Iowa, recently passed away. It was my pleasure to serve in the Iowa Senate with the late Senator Byers, who was beloved by all his colleagues and recognized as one of the foremost members of the Iowa Legislature in the history of the State.

In a recent issue of the Des Moines Register appeared an editorial entitled "The Gentleman From Linn," honoring the late Senator Byers. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENTLEMAN FROM LINN

Former Senator Frank C. Byers, of Marion, who died Thursday at 78, was an example of the fact that personality is a very useful ingredient in the work of Government and legislation.

His service of 32 years in the legislature was not the only thing which made him known to and will make him missed by all those who served in or watched the general assemblies of the last three decades.

His physique would not command attention. He was small and slight, but his influence as a leader of the urban bloc and as chairman of the smoothly run Judiciary Committee No. 2 of the senate was great. He had a flexibility which permitted him, in his last years of senate service, to act as adviser and counsellor for the freshmen, the new members, in their effort to form a bloc of their own.

He dressed immaculately and wore pince-nez glasses for years. His carnation was a badge of personality. He did not speak often but when he did it was with gentleness and humor that left no sting and no resentment. He retired from the membership but not the memory of the senate 2 years ago.

He was called for many years "The Gentleman from Linn." It was a title which characterized him.

THE INSIDIOUS CAMPAIGN TO SILENCE ANTI-COMMUNISTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the latest issue of the Reader's Digest appeared an article entitled "The Insidious Campaign to Silence Anti-Communists," written by William R. Kintner.

The article points out that the rather superficial attempt to silence anti-Communists, by those who like to call themselves anti-anti-Communists, actually is playing into the hands of the Soviet and Communist propaganda machine. I believe the article could be read with interest and could be of considerable help to everyone, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INSIDIOUS CAMPAIGN TO SILENCE ANTI-COMMUNISTS

(By William R. Kintner¹)

An insidious, Moscow-fed campaign to bleed the life out of anticommunism in America is now beginning to pay off. Within the past year it has created such a climate of distrust and confusion that scores of reputable anti-Communist authorities find themselves tainted, suspect, under vicious attack.

The newest target for exploitation by the Reds is the extremist hysteria currently evident in America. Millions of Americans have become discouraged by the years of confusion, contradiction, and empty posturing that have marked our efforts against communism. Out of a growing sense of frustration some have gathered into wrong-headed extremist cults such as the John Birch Society. Yet, instead of removing the cause of frustration on which such movements feed, some of our highest officials are attacking not just Birchites but experts on the Communist challenge. As a result, a deplorable set of double standards has developed. Persons who voice anti-Communist thoughts are reprimanded, while those who plead accommodation are rarely rebuked.

For example, in Okanogan, Wash., U.S. Forest Ranger Don Caron was forced to resign because he wrote anti-Communist articles for the local newspaper. His superiors said his writings were "controversial" and "reduced his effectiveness."

Yet when Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas publicly argues against U.S. policy to resist Red China's admission to the United Nations there is no censure, although the prestige of our highest Court is injected into foreign-policy matters outside its jurisdiction.

Last July the U.S. Navy was so wary of pressures against anti-Communists that it wouldn't even let one of its bands play at a Santa Monica, Calif., anti-Communist rally sponsored by 53 civic and service organizations, including the American Legion.

Many of the same people who a few years ago quite properly decried Senator McCarthy's "guilt-by-association" techniques in labeling persons pro-Communist now employ these same tactics to smear all anti-Communists as Birchite "extremists." No sooner was it disclosed that Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker belonged to the John Birch Society than numerous high-ranking military men found themselves subtly stamped with the Birchite-Walker label. The New York Times referred to Walker as just "the most

conspicuous example" of officers with theories akin to those held by Birchites. Much in the same vein, a report to the Fund for the Republic lumps such respectable publications as National Review and U.S. News & World Report with the discredited Birch Society's own journal.

Aided by such loose reporting, this drive which discourages and reprimands anti-communism in the United States not merely serves Russia's aims; it has its roots in Moscow's psychological and propaganda specialists. The Reds have fastened onto the extremist hysteria as a handy vehicle for mounting a well-laid campaign to split the United States in two and discredit both liberals and conservatives who urge tough-minded realism in dealing with communism.

The zeal with which the Reds are going about this is a tribute to a movement which had its beginning in 1955, when 1,000 educators, businessmen, and scientists assembled in Chicago for the first national Military-Industrial Conference to devise ways of meeting the Soviet technological challenge. The parley was so successful that it became a yearly event supported by eight universities, dozens of professional societies, labor unions, business groups and several U.S. Government departments. Moreover, it was put under the direction of a civilian-run, year-round organization, the Institute for American Strategy.

Meanwhile, alarmed by Communist intrusions and psychological gains, the White House urged that the public be better informed about cold-war problems. As a result, the University of Pennsylvania's Foreign Policy Research Institute was called upon to set up a 2-week seminar for 210 highly qualified military reservists.

In the summer of 1959, college presidents, deans, editors, members of Congress, Governors, lawyers, teachers, and businessmen gathered at the National War College and heard lectures by 55 top experts. Deeply moved by what they learned, many participants felt urged to alert their own areas. With the guidance of such organizations as the Institute for American Strategy, they organized weekend strategy seminars for which nearby Army posts made available their dormitories and assembly halls.

In the last 3 years, more than 50 of these forums have brought together 60,000 persons for intensive education about the enemy's methods and goals. In rare instances, speakers have slipped off the track into intemperate remarks—but this has happened only because the discussions have been carried on in such a frank and free atmosphere.

The public's understanding of communism was further sharpened by revelations made in congressional committees. Defectors from Russia's intelligence system appeared before our legislators and explained the Kremlin's sordid techniques of blackmail and murder. The Federal Bureau of Investigation unveiled the plans of the U.S. Communist Party members, obeying Moscow orders, to infiltrate and influence American youth.

As a result of all this activity, anticommunism developed into dynamic enlightened force in America—a movement so powerful that Khrushchev had to try to destroy it.

Evidence of the Kremlin's concern was a meeting held in Moscow in late 1960. Eighty-one Communist chieftains huddled for close to a month, then issued a startling manifesto which described the anti-Communist movement as "the principal ideological weapon" of Communist opponents and called on Communists around the world to participate in exposing anticommunism.

On January 6, 1961, Khrushchev summoned before him the elite of communism's psychological warfare experts. He told them that the rising anti-Communist movement had to be destroyed and stressed the necessity of establishing contacts with those

circles of the bourgeoisie which gravitate toward pacifism. His most revealing words: "We must use 'prudent' representatives of the bourgeoisie."

Khrushchev was confident that his international brainwashing apparatus could carry out these orders. From disclosures by defector MVD Col. Vladimir Petrov before the Royal Australian Commission and from congressional testimony of the CIA, we know how this apparatus operates. Dossiers in Moscow's espionage headquarters were combed for the names of unsuspecting persons in the United States who might do the Kremlin's work. Search was made for political leaders of our extreme left who might fall for a made-in-Moscow line, for ultra-liberal newsmen who would innocently echo Communist-inspired interpretations. Finally, the Kremlin experts on America screened conservatives, singling out extremists whose intemperance could be counted on to discredit all anti-Communists.

Such Communist use of legitimate liberals, conservatives and pacifists should be a matter of concern, not blame. They are equally victims of the devious mechanism which 60 years of Communist experience have perfected for moving the party's ideas deep into free societies. This transmission system functions through four rings, which are like ripples from a stone dropped in water, as one expert puts it. Ring one consists of actual Communist fronts linked closely to the Kremlin. Ring two is made up of blind pacifists and fuzzy intellectuals who occasionally aid Red aims. Ring three nears the mark that Moscow wishes to hit, the innocents: respected citizens who have influential connections but who are often professional protesters and crusaders, career cause people whose idealism is both genuine and naive. Ring four is composed of opinion-makers: editorial writers, news analysts, commentators, preachers, editors, educators. The ultimate objective of all this attention is the general public.

By the time the ripples from a counterfeit idea dropped in the middle of Ring one finally lap up on the shores of public opinion, it becomes virtually impossible to separate the innocent carriers from the knowing purveyors. The public at best is confused, at worst actually hostile to anticommunism. In either case, Moscow scores a clear gain.

The primary target is the Pentagon. For, as Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, a Democrat from Ohio, has explained: "If I had to advance communism in the world, I would urge the destruction of U.S. public confidence in our military men."

Last spring the Reds were handed a perfect opening wedge: discovery by the press of the extremist John Birch Society, plus a later revelation that one U.S. general was a member. This was enough to set some of our most influential newspapers off on a chase to show, with slim pickings for proof, that numerous officers were indoctrinating their commands and the civilian population with Birchite-type theories. This in turn was all that Gus Hall, boss of the U.S. Communist Party, needed to thunder that "even the Pentagon had to admit recently that it was worried over the extent of Birchite and similar influences among the ranking officers of the military services."

The controversy over rightwing extremists mounted. Often the shooting missed the main target and strafed legitimate anti-Communists and educational programs with a spray of guilt by association. Among those to be hit were the strategy seminars.

The furor reached its peak last summer when none other than the influential chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, dispatched a memorandum to the Pentagon castigating the seminar program.

As a result of all this, any effective seminar program was doomed. Unofficially, word

¹ William R. Kintner is deputy director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute and professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania. A West Point graduate, he served successively from 1950-61 as a Central Intelligence Agency planning officer, a staff negotiator at the Panmunjom armistice talks, and adviser at the White House on cold war operations, chief of long-range planning in the Office of Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. He is a coauthor of "Protracted Conflict" and "A Forward Strategy for America." His latest book, "The New Frontier of War," an analysis of Communist psychopolitical warfare, will be published this month.

* "This public responsiveness to the extremists' views is not without cause. There is a mounting sense of frustration over the trend of the cold war and the conviction that we are always on the diplomatic defensive. The way to disarm extremism is not to lecture the extremists but to remove the sense of frustration on which extremism feeds. The truth is that the West has been on the diplomatic defensive since the end of World War II" (Roscoe Drummond in New York Herald Tribune).

flashed down from the Pentagon through the officer corps to go easy on public "anti-Communist" remarks. In recent months, the sponsors of a proposed Louisiana-Arkansas-Texas session in Shreveport, La., on the Communist threat were told that "the Defense Department cannot participate in your seminar in any manner." In Virginia, a training program on communism for active-duty National Guardsmen had to be postponed. Throughout the Nation, citizens' groups wanting to learn more about our own strategy have been denied military cooperation.

Isn't it time we stopped such senseless suppression of responsible education about Khrushchev's plan to bury us? Unless the American people can realistically analyze together this total Communist threat, the Kremlin will watch its plan to paralyze us succeed, as we divide into a bitter civil war of words that will wreck our national unity. We must regain the real balance needed to allow all citizens to study Communist maneuvers and learn how to cope with them intelligently and forthrightly without being silenced or smeared. For when the day comes that we are prevented from fully comprehending why growing Communist power imperils freedom, and when we cannot discuss frankly what should be done to combat it—on that day our cause will be lost.

TRUMAN'S FARM VIEWS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the April 29 issue of the Des Moines Register is an editorial entitled "Truman's Farm Views."

The editorial cites the recent statement by the former Democrat President, Mr. Truman, to the effect that farmers are "the biggest yellers in the country."

Mr. President, I can understand why farmers might be yelling rather loud, in view of some of the recent activities in the Department of Agriculture, and in view of some of the proposals to place them under further Federal controls, but I cannot understand why a former President should make such a statement, even in an off-the-cuff remark.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD, because I believe that our farmers are interested in knowing what the former Democratic President has to say about them.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S FARM VIEWS

Former President Harry Truman was in Des Moines last week and he said something about farmers being "the biggest yellers in the country." Because of the farmers' peculiar ability to yell louder than anyone else they will be able to take care of themselves in the face of increasing city strength in Congress, he said.

This is the same Harry Truman who came to Des Moines and Dexter on September 18, 1948. He seemed to be a very sympathetic man then. He said the farmer had "saved millions of people from starvation" by ability to produce. He actually encouraged a little yelling provided, of course, that the yelling was at the Republicans.

"How many times do you have to be hit on the head before you find out what's hitting you?" he asked the farmers. "Are you going to let another Republican blight wipe out your prosperity?" He also said that Congress had "stuck a pitchfork in the farmer's back." In most barnyards a pitchfork in

the back is regarded as justifiable grounds for real first-class country hollering.

If anyone has any trouble reconciling the Truman attitude of 1948 and that of 1962 the answer may be found in something else he said in Des Moines Wednesday. He was asked if he is running for any office now. He said he isn't.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], numbered 5-21-62, known as the wheat amendment.

This amendment would strike from the bill, S. 3225, as reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the second alternate program upon which wheat farmers would be permitted to vote in a referendum.

The result of the Ellender amendment would be to give our wheat farmers a choice of voting for nothing—no acreage controls, no price supports, nothing except disaster—or for a 2- or 3-year national marketing quota programs, as determined and proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture; a quota, moreover, which would take into account any withdrawals of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks which the Secretary deems to be excessive, accompanied by a national acreage allotment also to be proclaimed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Without the Ellender amendment, our wheat farmers would be given a choice of voting for something—a continuation of the 1962 program with a 10-percent reduction in acreage on each farm, to be reimbursed by cash or in-kind payments, with present price supports; or a 2- or 3-year national marketing quota and acreage allotment program, such as I have previously described.

It seems to me that it is unfair to our wheat farmers to offer them a choice of disaster on the one hand or complete regimentation under control of the Secretary of Agriculture on the other hand. Indeed, the Secretary of Agriculture has too much power and control already without adding to it, as the Ellender amendment would do.

I am confident that our wheat farmers would reject the choice, if it can be so termed, of a completely federalized and federally controlled agricultural program in favor of a sensible program of reduced acreage to be paid for in cash or in kind. Moreover, properly administered, I am confident that the latter program would result in a substantial

reduction in production of excessive stocks of wheat.

The argument has been made that producers of cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts have been under Government controls for a long time, so why not do the same thing for wheat and feed grains? It is not quite as simple as that. Special circumstances differentiate these crops from wheat and feed grains. Tobacco and cotton are not used in livestock production, for example. Acreage involved in production is only one two-hundred-and-thirtieth that in wheat, feed grains, and oil seeds. Rice and peanuts are small acreage crops localized in their production.

Moreover, the program of controls which the Ellender amendment would practically force our wheat farmers to vote for is not the same as the program for these other agricultural commodities. If producers of cotton, rice, or peanuts voted against controls, those who nevertheless controlled their production would still be entitled to price support of 50 percent of parity and to protection against disposal of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks at less than price supports.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I doubt that the producers of tobacco, rice, cotton, and peanuts would ever have voted for their programs—indeed, I doubt that the Members of the Senate would ever have given them such a choice—if these had been so restrictive and harsh as the regimentation to which our wheat farmers would be subjected under this bill, if it is amended as the Senator from Louisiana recommends.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CANADIAN TAX INCENTIVES IN THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, few public statements which I have seen in recent months have so vividly dramatized the impact of the Canadian tax incentives in drawing American investment dollars north of the border, as an article in the Wall Street Journal of May 17, by Mr. Harlan S. Byrne reporting from Ottawa.

Mr. Byrne reports as follows:

U.S. businessmen and investors have a huge stake north of the border. At the end of 1960, U.S. investments in Canada totaled \$16.9 billion, up 64 percent from 5 years earlier. U.S. interests owned or controlled 44 percent of Canada's manufacturing industry, 53 percent of mining and 69 percent of petroleum.

As respects my own State of Minnesota, where traditionally American steel industry has found its chief supplies of iron ore, during the period when United States investments in Canada were rising by 64 percent, to a point where U.S. interests own or control 53 percent of the entire mining industry of Canada, there have been sharp cutbacks in iron mining in Minnesota and in iron mining investments in many areas of the State of Minnesota.

As I recall, the two exceptions—the Reserve Mining and Erie Mining—have established what we call taconite plants

and have proved that the type of processing of taconite ore carried on there is not only feasible, but it is competitive in the steel markets. I compliment these splendid companies on their initiative and willingness to develop the new process.

In other words, decisions were made by the boards of directors of the major steel and iron mining companies in this country to shift their iron ore production north into Canada out of the United States. This was done, clearly, in response to the heavy incentives offered by Canada, including a 3-year complete tax forgiveness feature for new iron mining installations.

The truth is that the State of Minnesota could not, if it wished, compete with the kind of tax incentives that the friendly nation to the north has been offering to our mining industry, and which have been so eagerly seized upon by our iron and steel industry leaders. What is required is a U.S. counter for such remarkable tax incentives as we face from other nations, and secondly, a determination on the part of the American iron and steel industry leaders that it is better business in the long run to maintain at least a reasonable balance in mining from American mines than foreign mines.

I note again that despite whatever our own State may do—and we have done much in terms of offering incentives, particularly in the taconite industry—we stand helpless as a single State in the tax structure unless changes are made in the Federal tax structure which at least would offer some competition to the incentives that are being offered by our neighbor to the north.

I am hopeful that the President's tax bill, together with what I hope will be additional incentives in the form of more rapid tax depreciation schedules for our mining equipment, will combine to persuade the iron and steel industry leaders that they should resume their policy of investing in the traditional areas of American iron ore mining.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the portion of the article entitled "Canada's Election" from the Wall Street Journal, May 17, written by Harlan S. Byrne.

There being no objection, the portion of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA'S ELECTION—LIBERAL PARTY COPIES KENNEDY TACTICS AS IT TRIES TO END TORY RULE—PEARSON FORCES USE POLLS, HIT STAGNATION—ECONOMIC UPTURN AIDS CONSERVATIVES—CURBS ON U.S. INVESTMENTS?

(By Harlan S. Byrne)

OTTAWA.—Campaign promises to "get the economy moving again" and "restore our lost international prestige"; thrusts at "wasted years" under the party in power; private polls to learn voter attitudes.

Remind you of John F. Kennedy's U.S. presidential campaign? As a matter of fact, they're fairly authentic reproductions by Canada's Liberal Party. The Liberals hope to profit from the lessons of the Kennedy victory as they seek to unseat the ruling Progressive Conservatives, or Tories, in Canada's general election June 18.

Liberal leader Lester B. Pearson and the party's other candidates for Parliament are

widely copying Kennedy campaign techniques and vote-catching phrases. Party professionals are all but using a handbook Theodore H. White's "The Making of the President, 1960," the Pulitzer Prize winning book that analyzes the Kennedy campaign methods. "They're practically following White's book page by page," says a Tory strategist.

The fortunes of the Liberals in recent years suggest they could use a few pointers. When Parliament was dissolved last month in preparation for the election, they held only 51 of the 265 seats. The Tories had an overwhelming 203. Eight of the remaining seats were held by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, a minor farm-labor group now rechristened the New Democratic Party, and three were vacant.

A RECORD MARGIN

Five years ago, in June 1957, the Tories ended 22 years of Liberal rule by winning 112 seats to the Liberals' 105. Since the Conservatives had fallen short of a majority of the seats in Parliament, Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker followed precedent and called a new election for March 1958. His government was swept back in by the widest margin in Canadian history.

Though it's highly risky to predict the outcome of this year's election, informed political guessing is that the Liberals will make sizable gains. In fact, the latest Gallup Poll, out last week, shows the Liberals in front. Of the voters interviewed who said they had an opinion, 45 percent favored the Liberals, 38 percent the Tories, and 17 percent other parties. However, a sizable group of voters—21 percent of those polled—were still undecided.

Whatever the outcome, the election will be watched closely by Americans. U.S. businessmen and investors have a huge stake north of the border. At the end of 1960, U.S. investments in Canada totaled \$16.9 billion, up 64 percent from 5 years earlier. U.S. interests owned or controlled 44 percent of Canada's manufacturing industry, 53 percent of mining, and 69 percent of petroleum. Trade between the United States and Canada is important, too, with each nation being the other's biggest customer. Last year the value of the two-way flow exceeded \$7 billion.

IMPACT OF OTTAWA'S POLICIES

Economic and fiscal policies of the Canadian Government have an effect on U.S. investments and trade with the next-door neighbor, and the next month of campaigning could provide clues to policy changes. The recent pegging of the Canadian dollar at a level seven and a half cents under the U.S. dollar, following nearly a year of monetary juggling, provided a solid example of the international repercussions of Ottawa's policies.

One purpose was to improve Canada's trade balance by making Canadian goods cheaper to buy abroad, in terms of other currencies, and by making it more costly for Canadians to import goods. Liberals are attempting to make devaluation a campaign issue by claiming the Tories bungled the handling and timing of the move. Yet the Liberals are committed to improving Canada's trade balance. So, whichever party is in power after the election, U.S. businessmen will be finding Canadian goods more competitive in foreign markets, and it will be tougher in the future to sell goods in Canada.

For years, U.S. domination of Canadian business has annoyed many Canadians. Politicians have not been loath to fan anti-American sentiment in past elections. Mr. Diefenbaker's 1957 and 1958 campaigns had a strong anti-U.S. flavor. While subsequent legislative moves to curb U.S. influence on Canadian industry have been much tamer than election promises of the past, the threat is still there. Currently Mr. Diefenbaker is resurrecting past proposals for a law requir-

ing part Canadian ownership of subsidiaries of foreign companies. Liberals are not as openly antagonistic to foreign ownership as the Tory leader, but they haven't taken a contrary stand.

FOOD SHORTAGE IN DAHOMEY, WEST AFRICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the dateline of May 19, Rome, there appeared the following article in the Washington Post on May 20:

AFRICANS CRAWL IN FOOD SEARCH

ROME, May 19.—Famine-stricken villagers in Dahomey, West Africa, are crawling on their hands and knees to towns in search of food, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization reported here.

Armand Defeber, FAO information officer, said in a report issued last night after a visit to northern Dahomey, that food disappeared from village markets some weeks ago.

Pitiful village reserves had also been exhausted by early May, when the full effects of the famine began to be felt. No deaths had so far been reported.

After seeing that quotation in the Reuters dispatch from Rome, I inquired of the food-for-peace office and the State Department as to what the facts were relating to our assistance to that country.

In August of 1961 a food pilot program of 200 tons of rice and 50 tons of flour to assist a use resettlement project in agricultural cooperatives and other economic development projects involving labor components was approved.

These commodities were shipped in September and October. Satisfactory completion of the pilot program demonstrated the feasibility of a larger program so that in November of 1961 a program of 2,950 tons of cornmeal, rice, and bulgur was approved. At the request of the Dahomey Government, shipments of these commodities started in January and are continuing at a rate of 300 tons per month. On March 22 a free distribution program was approved to supply 5,000 tons of cornmeal, flour, Milo, and milk for famine relief. Severe drought in north Dahomey have caused the exhaustion of food supply and famine conditions were expected to exist at the end of March 1962, and for 5 months until the next harvest. An estimated 80,000 persons require assistance, an average of one pound of food per day. The Government of Dahomey is financing the internal distribution costs. The government requested 10 shipments of each commodity at 2-week intervals beginning in mid-May. In fiscal 1962 in addition to approximately 8 million pounds of food provided in title II—which is the grant provision of Public Law 480—approximately 11 million pounds of food are being donated to CRS—Catholic Relief Service—under title III, for distribution to 257,000 individuals including families, refugees, and persons in schools, institutions, and summer camps. In fiscal 1963 almost 17 million pounds will be provided including the balance of 10½ million pounds to be shipped under title II, which again I say is the famine relief title, and 6½ million under title III, which is the charitable gift item.

The CRS title III program itself will supply food for 200,000 persons.

Any hunger existing today in Dahomey is not attributed to "parsimonious" attitude on the part of the U.S. Government administration in the food-for-peace program. Since supplies of food are moving in there at a rate adequate to fully meet the needs as based on advice of embassy personnel as well as the Dahomey Government, local areas of extreme distress in hunger can only be attributed to transportation difficulties and this would occur only in the most remote areas.

I note that, because one of the problems in the food-for-peace program in areas where transportation is inadequate, is the problem of distribution. Frequently when food is made available, it does not answer the human problem of famine and hunger merely because the distribution system is not immediately adequate to the task. I wish to make it quite clear that the host government is attempting to remedy that distribution problem in cooperation with the Government of the United States.

In other words, food is being moved in as fast as the Government can accept it. We have nothing to indicate the inadequacies of the supply being made available under the food-for-peace program. International limitations and port limitations are to blame. There is no scarcity over there that is attributed to the redtape here.

Mr. President, I have read this statement because I am deeply concerned about the food-for-peace program. It is very close to my heart. I have had a great deal to do with developing the program and sponsoring it. I wanted to make sure, when I read this particular article, that every effort was being made by our Government to help needy people.

The record will now demonstrate that we have moved. We moved a year ago in an experimental pilot program. We have been moving ever since March of last year. We have increased the supplies. We now have planned a big program for the fiscal year 1963.

In the farm bill which is now before us there are provisions relating to the food-for-peace program, called Public Law 480, in technical terminology. The program is possibly one of our most effective instruments of national policy. As such, it should be carefully guarded and promoted. I am hopeful that the efforts that were made today relating to the Chinese refugees will be heeded by the administration and that there will be a program of delivering food to these needy persons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 1962:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Virginia H. Phillips, Tuskegee Institute.
Hortense C. Quarles, Tyler.

ALASKA

Thomas L. Jackson, Sr., Kake.
Bertha A. Bousley, Metlakatla.

ARKANSAS

DeWitt C. Henry, Beebe.
Robert E. Russell, Bentonville.
John P. Lamb, Brookland.
Martha L. Rakes, Cave Springs.
Earl L. Pryor, Greenwood.
Ray M. McCarty, Helena.
Ava D. White, Mount Ida.
Mary E. Benbrook, Norfork.
Corbit White, Strong.
Fred L. Sullivan, Wickes.

CALIFORNIA

Marshall O. Clayton, Corcoran.
Lorna J. Evovich, Hickman.
John T. Little, Mill Valley.
Donald V. Lee, Orosi.
F. Clay Fisher, San Bruno.

FLORIDA

Eugene R. Nelson, Bushnell.
T. Grayson Screws, Fellsmere.
William M. O'Cain, Jasper.
Allen F. Kendall, Jensen Beach.
Stanley P. Nalls, Lutz.
R. Louise Cox, Montverde.
Dale W. Campbell, Roseland.

GEORGIA

Henry S. Dickson, Lilburn.
Elizabeth B. Minton, Pine Mountain Valley.
Hazel J. Shellhouse, Willacoochee.

IDAHO

Anna G. Bailey, Grand View.
James E. Jensen, Shelley.

ILLINOIS

Russel W. Miller, Ashley.
Rafmason F. Smith, Galva.
Frank P. Yost, Godfrey.
Charles H. Roberts, Salem.
Thomas D. Neal, Sandoval.

INDIANA

Carl F. Cloyd, Clinton.
Dale Hardeman, Lynn.

IOWA

Edward E. Nugent, Decorah.
Joseph F. Whelan, Elberon.
Deane A. Darrow, Fontanelle.
Ross B. Garrett, Glenwood.
Thomas E. Higby, Lehigh.
Chester B. Judd, Lineville.
John P. Loetz, Marquette.
Cornie J. Hulgen, Monroe.
Eva M. Harman, Plymouth.
Edward E. Monteith, Seymour.

KANSAS

Norbert F. Eisenbarth, Corning.
Ted H. French, Jamestown.
Adolph H. Goetz, La Crosse.
George I. Althouse, Jr., Sabetha.
John C. Burton, Syracuse.

KENTUCKY

Bernell D. Gifford, Eubank.
Joe W. Treas, Fulton.
Manville H. Fryman, Germantown.
Marguerite S. Crume, Mount Eden.
Harry Moberly, Richmond.
S. Orbin Stallard, Science Hill.

LOUISIANA

Cora E. Johnson, Boyce.
Kermit M. Pinsonat, Livonia.
Carrie E. Doughty, Tullos.

MARYLAND

Samuel U. Phillips, Hebron.
Oran R. Wilkerson, Lexington Park.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edward C. Berube, Fall River.
Frank W. MacLaughlin, Gloucester.

MICHIGAN

Reo E. Sievert, Ashley.
Clyde H. Schrock, Bellevue.
Arthur E. Fleetwood, Beulah.
Daniel J. Brosnan, Dowagiac.
Charles G. Osborn, Hart.
Clifford B. Brown, Jr., Stephenson.
Leo G. Ealy, Stanton.
John D. Wenzel, Sturgis.
Francis J. Donohue, Union Lake.
William J. Marinelli, Vulcan.
Oliver C. Ley, Williamston.

MINNESOTA

Dayle E. Ray, Barrett.
Marie L. Moore, Castle Rock.
Earl C. Mittag, Eagle Bend.
Lawrence V. Niehoff, New Ulm.

MISSISSIPPI

Lura A. Johnson, Glen Allan.
Horace S. Polk, Greenville.
Mary A. Thomas, Greenwood Springs.
James A. Raigins, Jr., Prairie.
Jack D. Mullen, State College.

MISSOURI

Stanley H. Crain, Boonville.
William R. Burk, Canton.
Glynn J. Evans, Carthage.
William W. Evans, Center.
Mildred B. Vick, Deering.
William C. Blair, Jefferson City.
Truman R. Taylor, Neelyville.
Lloyd E. McMullen, Slater.

MONTANA

Alice S. Fjell, Birney.

NEBRASKA

Thomas E. Dowd, Boys Town.
Charles E. Churchill, Fairbury.
Ignatius A. Polski, Loup City.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles J. Beaudette, Alton.
Richard W. Taylor, Londonderry.

NEW JERSEY

Charles H. Schubert, Allendale.
Carl A. Brueckner, Allenhurst.
Ruth M. Visick, South Dennis.
James P. DeMalo, Sr., Cedar Grove.
Norman Anderson, Flemington.
C. Wesley Barclay, Ocean City.

NEW YORK

Robert J. Skebey, Horseheads.

NORTH CAROLINA

Lemuel V. Young, Candler.
Wilson L. Fisher, Elizabethtown.
G. Smith Shaw, Ivanhoe.
J. Frank Smith, Lexington.
Edward L. Clayton, Tarboro.
John A. Harrelson, Whiteville.

OHIO

Joseph M. Bellissimo, Avon Lake.
William F. Wetzel, Jr., Clayton.
William Lawson, Geneva.
M. Kathryn Swank, Lewisburg.
Karl A. Krendl, Spencerville.
Mary L. Walker, Sugar Grove.
Claude M. McGee, Wilberforce.
Lewis E. Bales, Xenia.

OKLAHOMA

Ellen F. Kingery, Billings.
Dale A. Brenner, Blackwell.
Romaine S. McGuire, Crescent.
Willie B. Peacock, Fletcher.
Frankie G. Morrow, Konawa.
Marvin F. Anderson, Moore.
John H. McCasland, Oklahoma City.
Harris R. Underwood, Waukomis.

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul S. Weaver, Blain.
Frank Tulak, Finleyville.
Marie J. Schoppy, Locust Gap.
Robert J. Faust, Tower City.
Ernest S. Glatfelter, York.

TENNESSEE

Charles P. Carroll, Kingston.
Dorothy M. Barker, Readyville.
William R. Payne, Shelbyville.
Tom C. Morris, Waverly.

UTAH

Carmela P. Peterson, Castle Gate.
Grace H. Parker, Hooper.
Robert Q. Strong, Provo.

VIRGINIA

Wilson L. Coleman, Bowling Green.
Lillie M. Lowman, Iron Gate.

Jimmie G. Orr, Sr., Pennington Gap.
Lankford D. Malbone, Princess Anne.
Joseph T. Crosswhite, Jr., Virginia Beach.

WASHINGTON

Marvin J. Robbins, Burien.
Edward B. Pulice, Concrete.
Harold F. Evans, Coulee City.
James P. Daley, Zillah.

WEST VIRGINIA

Marvin L. Johnson, Logan.

WISCONSIN

Clarence J. Mashak, Bangor.
Robert G. Colburn, Benet Lake.
Ralph G. Kadau, Big Bend.
Robert J. Amo, Black River Falls.
William A. Sikora, Bonduel.
Robert M. Tabat, Dousman.

Blanche M. Huggett, Fall River.
Arnold B. Clausen, Granville.
Elgin F. Pacl, Hillsboro.
Patrick J. Shereda, Medford.
Chester J. Skelly, Milton.
Jack Rantz, Minocqua.
Walter A. Post, Mount Horeb.
Benedict C. Krause, Oak Creek.
John B. Ver Weyst, Stanley.
Allen E. Houle, Wabeno.
Carl H. Wolff, Wales.

WYOMING

Clarence L. Campbell, Buffalo.
Thomas A. Sawyer, Sheridan.

U.S. COAST GUARD

Vice Adm. Edwin J. Roland, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Speaker McCormack, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, Honor Chairman Brent Spence for 32 Years of Devoted Congressional Service

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency were privileged to attend a luncheon ceremony honoring the beloved chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. SPENCE, who is retiring after service as member or chairman of the committee for 32 years. The luncheon was given in the Speaker's dining room in the Capitol. Moving tributes to Mr. SPENCE were paid by Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon.

The formal remarks of Secretary Dillon follow:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Sullivan, and gentlemen, on March 4, 1931, our guest of honor, Chairman BRENT SPENCE, was sworn in as a Member of Congress from the Sixth District of Kentucky. In that Congress he was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee and has served either as a member or as chairman of this vitally important committee for 32 years. There has been no period in the history of the United States when his service to our country could have been more valuable.

In 1931, the United States was sliding toward the bottom of the cruelest depression in our history. Financial institutions were in grave jeopardy, confidence in the security markets was failing, and we were approaching a crisis in our gold reserves. That was a time of crisis, a time of uncertainty, and a time when the financial structure of our Nation was near collapse.

It was against this background that BRENT SPENCE took his seat as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. The legislative record of this Committee over the past 32 years reflects the manner in which our Nation met the crisis of 1931 and took subsequent steps against its recurrence.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created to insure the deposits in our

commercial banks. This legislation has eliminated the specter of bank failures and the consequent loss to depositors which had plagued the United States since the days of the first Secretary of the Treasury. The Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation were created to bring order and assurance into the affairs of our thrift institutions. The Federal Reserve System was given a thorough examination in the thirties and its authority and structure were overhauled by the Banking Act of 1935.

These three legislative developments—the creation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Home Loan Bank Board and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Banking Act of 1935, effectively restored confidence in our financial institutions and gave them a solid base for constructive growth.

In the forties, fifties, and sixties, the emphasis on many of our financial problems shifted from the domestic to the international scene. In 1945, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, BRENT SPENCE was a delegate to the Bretton Woods Conference, which created the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (commonly referred to as the World Bank) and the International Monetary Fund. You all know the part the World Bank has played in rebuilding the shattered economies of Western Europe and Japan and more recently, its efforts to improve the economic situation of the newly developing areas of the world. The International Monetary Fund has had an equally impressive record of achievement. Since 1959, most of the great industrial nations of the free world have made their currency freely convertible. This has laid a solid financial basis for an amazing increase in world trade since that time and for the rapid development of Western Europe and Japan.

The success of these two international financial organizations led to the creation of the International Finance Corporation, International Development Association, and Inter-American Development Bank. All of these organizations were designed to supplement the authority and resources of the World Bank and to bind together the free nations of the world in their attempts to bring some measure of economic hope to the less developed areas of the world.

I shall refer only briefly to other areas of responsibility carried by the Banking and Currency Committee and by Chairman BRENT SPENCE. This committee developed the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Small Business Administration; developed the first

attempts toward urban renewal and, during World War II and the Korean war, was responsible for developing a system of wartime controls to keep our economy within bounds.

With all these achievements in mind, we in the Treasury have tried for the past month to devise an appropriate citation for Chairman SPENCE. What could we say—what could we do for a man who has dedicated 32 years of his life to the service of his country and more especially to its financial institutions and practices? We decided that a dollar bill signed by the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury would be most symbolic of the career of this remarkable man.

For the President and myself, I am delighted to present this dollar signed by both of us to you, Chairman SPENCE, with grateful appreciation for your services to this Nation.

Irresponsibility of the Motion Picture Industry

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 22, 1962

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a situation which I believe is a matter for action by the gentlemen Members. I speak, therefore, not as a representative of the people of the great and sovereign State of Georgia, but as an average American mother—yes, even a grandmother, who was raised to believe in God, the sanctity of marriage, and the responsibilities that come with it, and the now supposedly old-fashioned principles of morality and fairplay upon which this great Nation was founded.

Throughout our glorious history the American woman, in spite of many hardships that often demanded all the courage she could muster, held fast to these same basic tenets and nurtured a nation that became the hope and envy of the world. It was not by sheer accident that she held its respect and admiration. Her reputation was above reproach. She was honored. American men would